

The recent history of Dutch orthography (II).

Problems solved and created

by the 2005 reform

Anneke NUNN and Anneke NEIJT

Dutch Department, Radboud University, Nijmegen

1. Introduction

In many languages, spelling changes are gradual and go unnoticed. Dutch spelling, however, is known amongst linguists for its recurrent reforms, which took place in 1954, 1995 and 2005.⁽¹⁾ It is no surprise, therefore, to find that ROGERS (2005:197) in his textbook on writing systems mentions Dutch as one of the few languages with a history of writing reforms. He claims that the reforms have been successful. Have they indeed?

From a sociological or political point of view, one may agree with Rogers, and conclude that the Dutch spelling reforms are a success because they were implemented, and because many writers try to follow the new rules.⁽²⁾ From the perspective of the Dutch language users, however, there are other aspects of the reform to be taken into account. Some people are against all kinds of spelling reform. They consider spelling reforms useless, a loss of culture or a sign of weakness of the language and its users. Others consider that any changes should simplify the spelling or solve orthographic problems. These may accept changes when they are explicit, adequately formulated, easy to learn and supported by dictionaries and spelling checkers. Therefore, language users may not share Rogers' positive conclusions.

(1) Here, only the years are mentioned in which new versions of the official spelling dictionary appeared after the seventh edition by DE VRIES & TE WINKEL in 1914. New spelling guidelines without updates of the dictionary were issued by the Dutch government in 1903, 1930, 1934, 1936, 1947 and 1955 (SCHAAP 1974:64-81). One may consider these changed guidelines as precursors of the reform in 1954, and one may consider the reforms of 1995 and 2005 marginal, compared to the 1947 reform (VERHOEVEN 2007:23-24). As far as we know, the Belgian government issued new guidelines without updates of the dictionary only in 1864 and in 1946. Notice that both authors are from the Netherlands. We aim to provide a relevant sketch of Dutch spelling reforms that covers the language area, crossing the borders of both countries.

(2) For a general overview of aspects of spelling reform, cf. NEIJT 2005.

In NEIJT & NUNN (1997) we evaluated the spelling reform of 1995 in view of the orthographic principles that underlie the relation between spoken and written language in Dutch. We concluded that while some problems had been solved, new ones had been created as well. Our closing remark concerned spelling stability over time (p. 23):

With so much opposition to the new spelling, it seems unlikely that it will remain the standard for long, which implies that Dutch spelling has gained nothing in stability as a result of this latest reform.

Indeed, it took scarcely a decade for further revisions to be put in place. This article deals with these latest reforms, which became effective in 2005. It does so in largely the same way we tackled the reforms of 1995 in our 1997 publication, to which it is the sequel.

Section 2 below deals with the background of the reform of 2005 (which became effective in 2006) followed by a short description of the way the spelling reform has been implemented and how it has been received. Section 3 focuses on which aspects of spelling have been changed. In section 4 we evaluate those changes in the light of the spelling principles we identified in the 1997 prequel, and also judge them from the perspective of writers and readers. And just like a decade ago, we will conclude that certain changes solve orthographic difficulties, whereas others cannot be seen as improvements, and a few even create new problems.

2. Background of the 2005 spelling reform

First we present the background of the reform of 2005, followed by a short description of the way the spelling reform has been implemented and how it has been received.

2.1. Dutch recent orthographic history

To appreciate the current spelling reform, some familiarity with the orthographic history of Dutch is mandatory. For a comprehensive account, see SCHAAP 1974, GEERTS ET AL. 1977, BOOIJ ET AL. 1978 and NEIJT & NUNN 1997. For our present purposes, however, the following rough outline will do.

The spelling rules of Dutch orthography designed by TE WINKEL (1863, 1865) became the standard orthography in Belgium in 1864 and in the Netherlands in 1883. In 1954, the spelling was simplified in some respects, as a consequence of the Royal Decision in Belgium and the spelling law in the Netherlands of 1946 and 1947. Unpronounced *ch* was done away with (*vleesch* → *vlees* ‘meat’), the number of vowel digraphs in open syllables was minimized (*zoo* → *zo* ‘thus’, *weken* → *weken* ‘weeks’ or ‘to soften’), and the writing of the often unpronounced case

endings became optional (which quickly resulted in the complete disappearance of those case endings except in fixed expressions). These changes were quite generally welcomed. This was not the case with the slightly changed rules for the linking element *e(n)* in compounds, which were based on a semantic distinction.⁽³⁾ Until 1954, one must write *en* for a plural as in *ganzenhoeder* ‘goose-herd, herd of geese’, and *e* for a singular as in *ganzenpen* ‘quill pen, quill of one goose feather’. Words that carried decidedly two meanings received two forms, cf. *ossevlees* and *ossenvlees* ‘meat of an ox, meat of oxen, beef’. The choice depends on the context. From 1954 onwards, one must write *en* only if the linking element necessarily denotes a plural, as in *ganzenhoeder* but not in *ossevlees*. This slight change of formulation reduced the number of variants, but the rules remained hard to apply and also led to variation in use, cf. HAGERS 1991:74, VAN STERKENBURG 1991:58, 68.

In similar vein, the new strategy for writing *bastaardwoorden* (‘hybrid words’, words of a foreign origin adapted to the Dutch pronunciation) was much frowned upon. The reformers had proved incapable of coming to terms with inconsistently spelled sets of words: sets within which some hybrids had already (partly) adapted to the Dutch spelling rules, whereas others had kept their original spelling. With respect to the graphemes *ph* and *rh* a clear decision in favour of dutchification was agreed upon, e.g. *photo* → *foto* ‘photograph’, and *rhododendron* → *rododendron*. In other cases, however, the reformers had been unable to agree whether or not to dutchify, so that spelling doublets were introduced. These consisted of pairs of ‘preferred’ and ‘allowed’ forms. Unfortunately, the choices between preferred and allowed had been made largely arbitrarily and were therefore hard to learn and remember. For instance, *accorderen* ‘to agree by signature’, *akkoord* ‘agreed, agreement’, *apotheek* ‘pharmacy’, and *vakantie* ‘holiday’ were all preferred, with *akkorderen*, *accoord*, *apoteek* and *vacantie* their allowed counterparts. Furthermore, differences arose between Dutch and Flemish writers as the former tended to use etymological spellings whereas Flemish writers preferred dutchified spellings (cf. HEYNE & HOFMANS 1988).

From 1954 until the spelling reform of 1995, the following areas of spelling were often, and sometimes hotly debated, but remained unchanged: verbal inflection (especially homophones, such as *besteed* ‘to spend, first person singular or past participle’ and *besteedt* ‘spend, third person singular’), etymology in native words (*noch* ‘neither’ and *nog* ‘still’, or *weids* ‘stately, wide’ and *wijd* ‘wide’), linking

(3) The linking element *e(n)* in compounds originates from stem allomorphy (*zon* – *zonne* ‘sun’) and case endings (genitive *–en* in *mannenstem* ‘male voice’). At present this element is most often identified with the plural ending of nouns, cf. SCHREUDER, NEIJT, VAN DER WEIDE & BAAYEN (1998) and NEIJT, SCHREUDER & BAAYEN (2004) or rhythm (NEIJT & SCHREUDER 2007). There is a broad analogy effect in the use of linking elements, cf. KROTT (2001) and KROTT, SCHREUDER & BAAYEN (2001).

elements in compounds (*bessesap* ‘berry juice’ and *bessenjenever* ‘berry genever’), apostrophes (*menu’s*, *menuutje* ‘menu, plural and diminutive’), hyphens and diereses (*radio-omroep* ‘radio broadcast’ and *zeeëend* ‘sea duck’). Several official advisory reports were written and subsequently rejected.

In 1980, the Netherlands and Belgium signed a treaty to cooperate in matters of language and spelling. This cooperation was called the Nederlandse Taalunie ‘Dutch Language Union’, often simply called Taalunie. The Taalunie began preparing for another spelling reform. In 1995, their work came to fruition through the publication of a new official spelling dictionary, replacing the one introduced in 1954.

This time, the spelling of hybrid words and of linking *e(n)* in compounds changed drastically. The spelling doublets were abolished by choosing the preferred spelling in almost all cases⁽⁴⁾. There were new rules for the spelling of linking *e(n)* which referred to plural form instead of plural meaning. These rules were simpler and resulted in a more constant spelling of words in compounds, though many exceptions were retained – details follow below. In addition, there were minor changes affecting capitals in adjectives derived from compound geographical names, and the distribution of diereses and hyphens.

This reform was successful in unifying the spelling of Flanders, the Dutch speaking part of Belgium, and the Netherlands. Most people adopted the majority of the new spelling rules, which is remarkable, since the changes of 1995 were drastic⁽⁵⁾. However, the conclusion of our evaluation of the 1995 spelling reform was that we did not expect this spelling to remain the standard for a long time, for the following reasons (NEIJT & NUNN 1997:18-23).

-
- (4) In 39 words the reformers selected the allowed variant. For instance: *k* → *c* in *insekt* → *insect* ‘insect’, because *dialect*, *effect* and *object* are written with a *c*, and *c* → *k* in *catheter* → *katheter* ‘drain’, because of *kathedr* ‘lectern’. See NEIJT & NUNN 1997:18.
- (5) Here are some facts about the scope of the reforms. In 1995 the spelling was changed of approximately 1.2% of the words in the dictionary, whereas the reforms of 2005 affected 2.6% (PERMENTIER 2005:195). In 1995, however, more frequently used words changed than in 2005, so that the earlier reforms had a stronger impact on everyday texts. In 1995, the reforms remained limited to just four areas: hybrid words, linking elements, diacritics and derivations of geographical names. Those of 2005 had a much wider scope, affecting not only hybrid words, linking elements and diacritics once again, but also hyphenation, diminutives, lower and upper case, inflection of loan verbs, and the use of spaces. The number of spelling rules increased too in 2005. DE SCHRUYVER (2005) distinguishes approximately 60 new rules, DE SCHRIJVER & NEIJT (2005:323-333) mention 90 rules either added or slightly changed. The former edition of this book (2002) contained 259 spelling rules, the latest version (2005) has no fewer than 290.

1. The spelling reform did not address all spelling issues under discussion; the spelling of verbs and hybrid words was not simplified.
2. The spelling reform introduced new problems with respect to the linking schwa in compounds: a counterintuitive new rule was introduced with many exceptions and with sub-rules based on extralinguistic knowledge such as the so-called fauna-flora rule (*vossebes* ‘fox berry’, but generally *vossenjacht* ‘fox hunt’).
3. Inconsistencies in the spelling of loan words remained, some new inconsistencies were introduced, and no guidelines were provided for the spelling of future loan words. Guidelines are crucial to be able to write inflected forms of these new words and of words that entered the language long ago, but tend not to be dutchified. An example is *bridge*, a popular game in the Netherlands. *To play bridge* may be phrased as *een bridgeje leggen*. Or should one write *bridge’je* or *bridgje*?
4. The official spelling dictionary contained many errors and ambiguously worded rules.
5. The most authoritative and comprehensive Dutch dictionary, Van Dale’s *Groot woordenboek der Nederlandse taal* [Van Dale 1995] decided to use slightly different and more consistent rules. These led to different spellings for approximately a thousand words (a smattering of loan words and a large number of compounds with linking schwa). The Van Dale spelling was also used by other dictionary publishers. Together, they published an alternative spelling dictionary (NEIJT & REINSMA 1995). This dictionary had a red cover, in order to distinguish it from the standard spelling dictionary with a green cover, known by the nickname *het Groene Boekje* ‘the Green Booklet’. For this reason we will refer to the spelling variants as ‘Green’ or ‘Red’. The Green Booklet is henceforth abbreviated as GB; incidentally, the nickname *Het Groene Boekje* became the title on the cover of the 2005 edition.

The effects of the 1995 spelling reform can thus be summarized as follows:

problems solved in 1995	problems created in 1995
1. The notoriously deficient and outdated spelling dictionary of 1954 was finally updated.	1. Many errors and inconsistencies found their way into the new spelling dictionary, ultimately giving rise to two divergent spelling dictionaries (‘Green’ and ‘Red’).
2. The rules for spelling linking <i>e(n)</i> in compounds were fundamentally changed, resulting in a constant spelling of most words in compounds.	2. A great many exceptions concerning the spelling of linking <i>e(n)</i> were introduced, plus a minor rule involving extralinguistic knowledge.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 3. Nearly all variant spellings of hybrids were abolished. The conventionally divergent spellings in Flanders and the Netherlands converged. | 3. By arbitrarily choosing among former variants, many inconsistencies in the spelling of related words were introduced. |
|--|--|

The situation of two spelling standards, Green and Red, was ill-favoured by all parties. Therefore, deputies of Van Dale's dictionaries and the Taalunie solved this situation by mutual agreement. Lists of errata were added to Van Dale's lexicon and to the spelling dictionary issued by the Taalunie. This removed most differences. The set of flora-fauna-compounds, though, remained as a systematic difference between the two spellings.

The spelling law of 1995 stated that an update of the spelling dictionary would appear every ten years (see for details on the legal implementation of this reform NEIJT 2002b). The update of 2005 was used to eradicate the errors introduced in 1995 and the differences between the Green and Red spellings.

A second, less straightforward goal of the update was to make the existing rules more explicit and extend their coverage, without changing their outcome, the spelling. To pull off this rather complex feat the Taalunie installed a spelling task force (*Werkgroep Spelling*), in which linguists from both Flanders and the Netherlands participated. This task force designed the reforms described in section 3. Quite understandably, it turned out to be impossible to design new rules without changing their outcome. The changes have been called adaptations to common practice in later publications by members of the spelling task force (VERKUYL 2005, *Werkgroep* 2006, DAEMS 2006:2; *change* is Du. *verandering*, *adaptation* is Du. *aanpassing*).

True to its brief, the *Werkgroep* effected changes on minor issues and small sets of words only. One might therefore consider the spelling reform of 2006 a non-reform, as did the Taalunie in the introduction of the new dictionary, though an earlier official statement mentioned 2.6% changes in the main entries of the dictionary, cf. *Persverklaring* 2005:2. This means that 2.600 entries changed. Its very real effect, however, was that language users lost control over the system, because the reform lacked a principled approach of the relation between the language and its writing system.⁽⁶⁾ As a consequence, just like what happened ten years before, the *Werkgroep* ended up introducing new inconsistencies while removing existing ones.

(6) Arguments supporting this conclusion will be given in the remainder of this article. Our evaluation concurs with De Gloppe's (*Interview with C.M. de Gloppe* 2005), who claims that the spelling reform committee of the Taalunie in 1995 did "sloppy work, unsystematic and insufficiently thorough. [...] In schools, a lot of time and attention is devoted to spelling. But there is great uncertainty about spelling among both teachers and pupils. This is paid insufficient heed to by those who primarily wish to smooth out every last wrinkle in the rule system. [...] Should another committee appear ten years from now to overhaul the spelling, it would be well

2.2. Implementation of the spelling reform

The purely linguistic task of defining adequate spelling rules is not an easy one, but it is even more daunting for governments to implement a new spelling. All over the world proposals for spelling reforms by official spelling committees fall by the roadside more often than not. So how did the Taalunie succeed in 2005? Some details of the operation are worth mentioning: the *Spelling Platform*, the *Taalunie Keurmerk Spelling*, the way publicity was handled, and the new spelling law in the Netherlands.

Well in advance of the intended reform, the Taalunie created a Spelling Platform in which they asked lexicographers and editors for advice about how to implement the new spelling. It would be profitable for all parties if new editions of dictionaries and textbooks would be available shortly after the publication of the new Taalunie spelling. To enable this platform to work, its members received strictly confidential information about the spelling reform before it was approved by the highest body of the Taalunie, the Committee of Ministers.⁽⁷⁾

Furthermore, the Taalunie created a Keurmerk Spelling, a brand indicating that a dictionary, spelling checker or spelling manual complies with the Taalunie spelling. Publishers want this brand, because it may sway schools and the civil service towards adopting their publications. This also enhanced compliance to the new spelling rules.

Publicity has been handled with utmost care. Shortly after the spelling reform in 1995, an extensive ministerial note added to the new spelling law contemplated the publication of a new version of the spelling dictionary in 2005. This note stated also that the next version would not contain new rules. Even though the Taalunie proposed real changes, these have consistently been called adjustments of issues that often led to spelling questions. In their preface of the spelling dictionary, the Committee of Ministers explicitly states that the orthography has not been changed, and

advised to get into the schools to investigate the learnability of the new rules.” (“De overheidscommissie die de spellingherziening van '95 heeft gedaan, heeft half werk geleverd; onsystematisch en weinig doortastend. [...] In het onderwijs wordt aan spelling veel tijd en aandacht besteed. Maar de onzekerheid over spelling is bij leerkrachten en leerlingen erg groot. Daar is onvoldoende aandacht voor bij de mensen die het regelsysteem vooral sluitend willen krijgen. [...] Als er over tien jaar weer een commissie komt die de spelling op de schop neemt, dan zou die commissie onderzoek moeten doen op scholen naar de leerbaarheid van de nieuwe regels.”)

- (7) The Spelling Platform received inter alia the *Technische Handleiding*, an unpublished document of the Werkgroep Spelling (February 10, 2005) that has been approved later by the Committee of Ministers of the Taalunie (April 25, 2005). This document underlies the guidelines of the spelling dictionary (October 15, 2005). It is, however, not widely available. Whenever possible, we therefore refer to the guidelines instead, which have equally been approved by the Committee of Ministers.

that the list of items has merely been actualized and technically improved (GB 2005:14):

The spelling rules have not been changed in 2005. But they were reformulated wherever the rules were obscure in practice, and in particular when there were real or apparent contradictions between the rules and their application in the dictionary. In addition, some issues that were not treated exhaustively in former editions are now described more clearly (“De spellingregels zijn voor de uitgave van 2005 niet veranderd. Maar waar uit de praktijk is gebleken dat er onduidelijkheden bestonden, en zeker waar er schijnbare of echte tegenspraak bestond tussen de regels en de toepassing ervan in de Woordenlijst, werden ze anders verwoord. Daarbij worden enkele kwesties die in vorige edities niet uitputtend waren behandeld, nu duidelijker beschreven.”)

However, those who read on discover that the Committee ultimately admits to making at least one real change: the removal of the fauna-flora rule that was an exception to the rules for linking elements in compounds. In fact, a whole host of minor changes was introduced, and the guidelines had been thoroughly reformulated too. This surprised and angered many, convincing them that the spelling dictionary of 2005 surreptitiously introduced new guidelines, not only new formulations.

Much ado ensued, resulting in a new threat to the spelling uniformity that had been gained by the reforms of 1995 and 2005. Protesters designed and published an alternative, so called ‘White’ spelling (GENOOTSCHAP ONZE TAAL & DANIELS 2006), about which we will say more in section 2.3. Some time afterwards, in May 2006, the Taalunie published a brochure in which it admitted to changes in three areas: linking elements in compounds, the use of spaces and hyphens, and the use of capital letters.

The spelling reform of 1995 had been given legal status by a spelling law in the Netherlands that mentioned both a spelling dictionary and the spelling rules approved by the Committee of Ministers. At the same time the old spelling law of 1947 remained intact. (See for details NEIJT 2002a, 2002b). The reform of 2005, however, involved replacing all former Dutch spelling laws by a new one that simply defines the situations in which use of the Taalunie spelling is required. The literal text of this new Dutch spelling law is as follows (Art. 2.1):

The spelling of Dutch decided upon by the Committee of Ministers, will be used at public bodies, at institutes of education which receive public funding, and in exams for which legal directions have been established. (“De schrijfwijze van de Nederlandse taal waartoe het Comité van Ministers beslist, wordt gevolgd bij overheidsorganen, bij de uit de openbare kas bekostigde onderwijsinstellingen, alsook bij de examens waarvoor wettelijke voorschriften zijn vastgesteld.”)

Presumably, similar laws will be issued in Flanders and Surinam (though at the moment of writing this text, we could not find any). The obvious advantage of this law is that it remains unchanged when a new spelling is decided upon by the ministers of the Taalunie. Legal implementation of the orthography of Dutch has been simplified enormously. A drawback of this simplification is that democratic control is minimal: no other means are available than direct appeal to the Committee of Ministers or the Interparliamentary Committee, that needs to approve of the decisions by the ministers. Neither government nor parliament play a role.

2.3. Reception of the spelling reform

As soon as the new reforms were made public, there was fierce opposition in the Netherlands. A counter movement was launched by a number of Dutch newspapers and the society *Onze Taal* ('Our Language'), a body consisting of some 35.000 members with a lively interest in the Dutch language, and their own monthly journal. Starting in 1998, *Onze Taal* had been publishing its own spelling dictionary, called *Spellingwijzer Onze Taal* 'spelling manual Onze Taal' and generally known as the *Witte Boekje* 'White Booklet'. In 2006, a revised edition of this *Witte Boekje* was published, after consultation of linguists and laymen via a questionnaire on the web. The White Spelling deviates from the Green Spelling "when there is a better alternative"⁽⁸⁾. There are some 900 deviations from the official spelling (GENOOT-SCHAP ONZE TAAL & DANIËLS 2006:43).

The White Spelling was adopted by many language users and publishers in the Netherlands, including some national newspapers, much to the chagrin of most teachers. Representatives of Dutch and Flemish educational associations published a newspaper article explaining that spelling variation in classrooms is counterproductive, cf. ROOIJACKERS ET AL. 2005, RYMENANS 2006.

Assessing the long term impact of the alternative White Spelling is difficult. Given that everyone in the civil service must follow the new spelling norms for all official business, it seems unlikely that alternative spellings will prevail. But what will happen in society at large? Much depends on the spelling checkers provided. The requirement that schools teach the Green Spelling, guarantees the development and availability of Green Spelling checkers. Will alternative spelling checkers be readily available to everyone?

Presumably, all will be settled within a few years, as happened before with the variation introduced by Van Dale. The differences between Green and White

(8) Some of the alternative spellings are *glij-ijzer* 'skate' instead of *glijijzer*, and *10-eurobiljet* '10 euro bill' instead of *10 eurobiljet*. Sometimes spelling alternatives are introduced: *appèl* - *appel* 'appeal', *fondue(e)* 'fondue', *ideeë(n)loos* 'without ideas', *panne(n)koek* 'pancake', *cadeau* - *kado* 'gift'.

Spelling are small, as were the differences between Green and Red Spelling of 1995. The alternative spelling used by Onze Taal and the newspapers may go unnoticed and presumably will not really threaten orthographic unity. It is difficult to predict what will happen in 2015, when the Taalunie will publish their third version of the Green Booklet. Presumably the Taalunie will adopt a number of the alternative White Spelling forms, as they did before with Red Spelling forms.

3. Changes in 2005

In 2005, most of the areas changed in 1995 were again slightly changed, and new rules were introduced for the use of capital letters and spaces. In what follows, we present an overview of these changes. Comprehensive lists of spelling rules can be found in PERMENTIER 2005 (a list of 230 spelling rules) and DE SCHRYVER & NEIJT 2005:323-333 (a list of 200 unchanged rules and 90 added or changed ones).

3.1. The spelling of the linking element *e(n)* in compounds

In 1995, a complicated set of rules was introduced governing the spelling of linking elements in compounds, which was slightly amended in 2005:

1995 (GB 1995:25-26)	2005 (GB 2005:60-66)
<p>Main rule Write <i>n</i> when the first part of the compound is a noun that exclusively takes (<i>e</i>)<i>n</i> to form a plural (<i>bessensap</i> ‘currant-juice’, <i>boerendochter</i> ‘farmer’s daughter’). Elsewhere no <i>n</i>.</p>	<p>Main rule We write the linking sound as <i>en</i> when the left part of the compound is a noun that has a plural in <i>-en</i>, but not a plural in <i>-es</i>. Elsewhere, we write <i>e</i>.</p>
<p>Exceptions: I. the first part refers to a person or object that is unique in the given context: <i>Koninginnedag</i> ‘queen’s day’, <i>zonneschijn</i> ‘sunshine’, <i>Onze-Lieve-Vrouwetoren</i> ‘Our Lady’s Tower’</p>	<p>Exceptions: I. idem, but restricted to compounds with (<i>Onze</i>-)<i>Lieve-Vrouw</i>, or (<i>onze</i>)<i>lievevrouw</i> ‘Our Lady’, <i>zon</i> ‘sun’, <i>maan</i> ‘moon’ and <i>hel</i> ‘hell’. Also <i>Koninginnedag</i>, <i>Koninginnefeest</i> ‘queen’s holiday’ and <i>koninginnenacht</i> ‘queen’s night’. Other compounds with <i>koningin</i> follow the main rule: <i>koninginnenpage</i> ‘swallowtail’.</p>

II. the first part has an intensifying meaning and the compound is an adjective: <i>beregoed</i> , bear+e+good 'very good'	II. idem, but more examples mentioned for clarification
III. fauna-flora exception: words composed of an animal name and a plant name: <i>paardebloem</i> , horse+e+flower 'dandelion'	III. deleted
IV. idiosyncratic compounds with a body part as first member: <i>kinnebak</i> , chin+e+tray 'jaw-bone'	IV. a more general formulation: 'idiosyncratic or apparent compounds': <i>bolleboos</i> , <i>kinnebak</i> ⁽⁹⁾
V. one of the parts is not recognizable as a separate word in its original meaning: <i>bolleboos</i> round+e+angry 'clever clogs, bright person'	V. merged with IV
	VI. We never write <i>en</i> in derivations except in some cases before the suffixes <i>-achtig</i> , <i>-schap</i> and <i>-dom</i> : <i>vorstelijk</i> 'royal', <i>vorstendom</i> 'kingdom'. (This new formulation changed <i>ideeënloos</i> → <i>ideeëloos</i> 'without ideas', cf. below.)

Observe that the rephrased main rule explicitly mentions plurals in *-es* (incorrectly, the plural suffix is not *-es* but *-s*. The form *-es* occurs only in exceptional loan words such as *rector* – *rectores*). Thus, it shows more readily why the rule is so difficult to understand: in order to decide on writing an *n* or not, one has to take into account a possible plural in *s*. This aspect of the rule was formerly only implicitly present in the word *exclusively* ⁽¹⁰⁾.

(9) A list of 34 compounds is given. In 1995, a set of 87 forms was available (see *Uitleg Extra* 1996:11). We did not check all 87 forms, but it seems that the spelling of this set did not change. It is not clear why a smaller set of exceptional examples has been selected for publication. Do children need to learn the smaller set by heart? And is therefore a more realistic number of 34 items selected?

(10) A simpler set of rules with the same output is available, cf. *Spellingrapport* 1994:72-73. There is also a rule of thumb (p. 75) based on input forms only: "When the first word of the compound does not end in an <e> by itself, and if this word is a noun, one should write <en>. In all other cases one should write <e>." An example of the first case is *kip* – *kippensoep* 'chicken – chicken soup'. An example of the latter case is *groente* – *groentesoep* 'greenery, greenery soup'. The

A real change is the abolishment of the fauna-flora rule. This means that *paardebloem* should be written with *en*, as *paardenbloem*, in line with corresponding compounds such as *paardenarts* ‘horse doctor’ and *paardenbeen* ‘horse’s leg’. The remaining exceptions have not been abolished and still lead to different spellings of the same compound member: *koninginnenpage* versus *Koninginnedag* (exception I), *berenhol* ‘bear’s den’ versus *beregoed* (exception II), and *bollenveld* ‘bulb field’ versus *bolleboos* (exception IV).

Another change is the reinterpretation of the affix *-loos* ‘-less’. Combinations with *-loos* used to be treated as compounds, which is supported by the fact that *loos* also occurs in isolation, as in *loos alarm* ‘false alarm’ and *veel noten zijn loos* ‘many nuts are empty’. This concurs with the fact that *-loos* belongs to the group of semi-suffixes that are written with *-en* such as *-arm* (*soortenarm* ‘species-poor’), *-rijk* (*soortenrijk* ‘species-rich’), and *-vrij* (*schuldenvrij* ‘debt free’). See KLEIN (2005) for a more detailed discussion of the spelling of this suffix. The real issue here concerns homography. The word *grenzeloos* usually means ‘extremely’, but its literal meaning is ‘without borders’, cf. *een grenzeloos vertrouwen* ‘blind faith’ and *een grenzeloos Europa* ‘a Europe without borders’. Those who are consciously aware of the distinction may be inclined to avoid homography. The principled issue behind it is whether or not orthography should discriminate between literal and figurative use of words.⁽¹¹⁾

Finally, there are some changes in individual words (not mentioned in the overview above), on the grounds of revised judgments on plural forms or idiosyncrasy. Hence *gazellenoog* ‘gazelle’s eye’ → *gazelleoog* (plural *gazellen* and *gazelles*), *giraffehals* ‘giraffe’s neck’ → *giraffenhals* (*giraf* has only plural *giraffen*), *paddestoel* ‘toad’s stool, mushroom’ → *paddenstoel* (no longer considered idiosyncratic), *dronkelap* ‘drunkard’ → *dronkenlap* (*-en* is part of the adjective *dronken* ‘drunk’).

official rule and this rule of thumb share their output, since the plural of words not ending in *-e* usually is *-en*, whereas the plural form of words ending in *-e* usually is *-s*.

- (11) The issue can be illustrated as well with *kattebelletje* ‘scribbled note’ and *kattenbelletje* ‘bell for a cat’. These two forms were introduced by the Werkgroep Spelling in 1995. The first one is derived from Italian *carta bello*, adapted as a form of folk etymology in Dutch. Users of Dutch may not be aware of the different origin of these words, and again, one may legitimately ask the question whether or not one should distinguish in spelling what is not distinguished in spoken language. Language use constantly vacillates between the literal and the figurative. A general approach is needed for such kinds of creative language use.

3.2. The spelling of loan words

Traditionally, loan words are divided into hybrids and foreign words (TE WINKEL 1865:175). Hybrids are words of foreign origins that have (partly) adapted to Dutch phonology and morphology, whereas foreign words are not. Spelling changes in Dutch generally affected hybrid words only. In foreign words, only minor changes occurred such as deletion of accents or changes that are needed to create proper spellings of inflected forms. The glossary of the Green Booklet of 2005 no longer refers to hybrid words (GB 2005:1045, 1049). Moreover, a word such as *kasteel* ‘castle’ is considered a native word, against standard practice (TE WINKEL 1865: 203, VAN HEUVEN, NEIJT & HIJZELENDORRN 1995, NUNN 1998).

The changes to the spelling of hybrid words in 2005 are modest compared to those of 1995. (Recall that large numbers of words had two approved variants until 1995, when for each of those words one variant was given standard status to the exclusion of the other.) Significantly, the guide of the Green Booklet of 2005 no longer contains a chapter devoted to the spelling of hybrid words. The spelling of native and hybrid words is described simultaneously, sound by sound. For instance the spelling of the sound /i/ is illustrated with hybrid words such as *kwestie* ‘issue’, *actief* ‘active’, *gitaar* ‘guitar’ as well as native words such *die* ‘that’, *lief* ‘sweet’ and *spiegel* ‘mirror’ (GB 2005:21). This approach obscures the generalizations *within* native words and *within* hybrid words that form the foundation of Dutch orthography, cf. NUNN & NEIJT 1997, and NUNN 1998:81-88.⁽¹²⁾

In the case of consonants, some “rules of thumb” are given, e.g.

- We write *c* in *-act*, *-actie*, *-actief*, *-ca*, *-caresse*, *-caris*, *-caster*, *-cateur*, *-catie*, *-cator*, *-catrice*, *-cus*, *-ect*, *-ectie*, *-ectief*, *-ica*, *-icus*, *-scoop*, *-uct* or *-uctie*.
 - We write *c* word-initially in the non-native elements *co-*, *col-*, *com-*, *con-*, *contra-*, *cor-* and mostly in *cata-*, *cate-*, *crypt-*, *crypto-*, *loco-*, *macro-*, *micro-*, *necro-*, *oct-*.
 - We write *k* in *elek-* in words that are related to *elektriciteit* ‘electricity’.
- (GB 2005:25-26)

Such generalizations were absent in the dictionary of 1995. They are reminiscent of the more systematic approach to hybrid words proposed by the spelling committee in 1994 (*Spellingrapport* 1994:35-83).

(12) These generalisations lead to a smaller set of exceptions to the rules. For instance, [i] is always written as *ie* in native words, except in the word *bijzonder* ‘special’. It is also written *ie* in the final syllable of many underived hybrid words (in order to create an adequate spelling for forms with suffixes). In pre-final syllables, one finds usually *i* in hybrid words. When the class of native words is not distinguished from the class of hybrid words, either the large set of native words will be exceptional, or the large set of hybrid words.

Incidental changes in the choice of letters are those in (1), cf. [Overzicht 2005]:

(1)	1995	2005	gloss
a	<i>fabrikaat</i>	<i>fabrikaat</i>	manufacture
	<i>predikaat, predicatie</i>	<i>predicaat, predicatie</i>	predicate, sermon
	<i>koloriet</i>	<i>coloriet</i>	colouring
	<i>diskman</i>	<i>discman</i>	disc man
	<i>Kongolees</i>	<i>Congolees</i>	Congolese
b	<i>Corinthisch</i>	<i>Korinthisch</i>	Corinthian
	<i>klavarscribomethode</i>	<i>klavarskribomethode</i>	name of musical notation

In (1a) *k* is changed into *c*; in (1b) *c* is changed into *k*. These choices remain without justification. Overall consistency has not been achieved by these changes, as shown by related forms. The inconsistent sets are now *fabrikaat* – *fabriek* – *fabrikant* ‘manufacture, factory, manufacturer’, and *predicaat* – *predicatie* – *prediken* – *predikant* ‘predicate, sermon, to preach, preacher’.

Some changes have been introduced with respect to accents in loan words. The new rules are as follows:

- French words lose their accents when these words are commonly used. Accents on the *e* remain only if they are crucial to encoding the correct pronunciation.
- All accents remain when a word, and particularly a word group, is still considered French. (GB 2005:30)

Some examples are given in (2):

(2)	1995	2005	gloss
a	<i>procédé</i>	<i>procedé</i>	process
	<i>révérence</i>	<i>reverence</i>	curtsy
	<i>appèl</i>	<i>appel</i>	appeal
b	<i>à propos</i>	<i>à propos</i>	to the point
	<i>réussiet</i>	<i>réussite</i>	success

The examples in (2a) lose their accents. *Procedé* only keeps the final one to prevent the *e* from being pronounced as a schwa. In the case of *appèl* the accent is crucial to distinguish it from the native word *appel* ‘apple’, but the accent has probably been stricken since it does not occur in the original French word. In other words, the original spelling in the donor language plays a role in the current reform of Dutch, even though the word has been introduced long ago. This strategy implies that the spelling of Dutch words might change when the spelling of the donor language changes.

The examples in (2b) show that an earlier dutchification is reversed in words and word groups that are not considered to be common usage at the moment. The

spelling of some words and most word groups with French accents remains unchanged: *maîtresse*, *déjà vu*, *génant*.

The guidelines on the use of hyphen and dieresis in contexts of vowel clashes are slightly changed. Vowel clash is ‘the confusion that may arise when two letters that normally denote one vowel or diphthong (e.g. *aa* or *ui*), have to be read separately (as *a-a* or *u-i*)’ (GB 2005:51). Both the dieresis and the hyphen signal a syllable boundary. A general guideline is that hyphens are used between words, and that diereses are used within words, as in *na-apen* ‘to mimic’ (lit. ‘to after-ape’) versus *Kanaän* ‘Kanaan, the biblical name’. Understandably, the dieresis is abolished in the prefix *aero-* where *aë* encodes one syllable, e.g. *aërodynamica* → *aerodynamica*. A new rule regulates diereses after neoclassical prefixes:

- A derivation with a prefix of Greek or Latin origin is treated as a compound. The prefix is glued to its base. In case of vowel clashes, the derivation receives a hyphen as linking element.
(GB 2005:53)

This rule affects words like *reïntegratie* → *re-integratie*, *coëxistentie* → *co-existentie* and *deëscaleren* → *de-escaleren*. There are, however, exceptions:

- A word in which a non-native prefix cannot be separated from the base word is treated as underived and the vowel clash is solved by dieresis.
(GB 2005:54)

This rule applies to words such as *coëfficiënt* ‘coefficient’ and *coördinatie* ‘coordination’, which are not transparently related to *efficiënt* ‘efficient’ and *ordinatie*, a word that is not mentioned in the spelling dictionary.

Some inflected forms of hybrid words have also been changed (GB 2005:93-94), for instance the diminutives of the French words *diner*, *souvenir* and *depot*, and the female agent noun derived from *skiën* ‘to ski’:

(3)	1995	2005	base and gloss
a	<i>dineetje</i> <i>souveniertje</i> <i>depootje</i>	<i>dinertje</i> <i>souvenirtje</i> <i>depotje</i>	<i>diner</i> ‘supper’ <i>souvenir</i> ‘souvenir’ <i>depot</i> ‘depot’
b	<i>skister</i>	<i>skiester</i>	<i>ski</i> ‘female skier’
c	<i>omaatje</i> <i>cafeetje</i> <i>taxietje</i>	<i>omaatje</i> <i>cafeetje</i> <i>taxietje</i>	<i>oma</i> ‘grandma’ <i>café</i> ‘pub’ <i>taxi</i> ‘taxi’

The spelling of the examples in (3a) used to be adapted in order to agree more with their pronunciation. In *souvenir*, the *i* represents a long vowel rather than the short

one that is usual in closed syllables. In *diner* and *depot* the final vowel is also long and the consonant is silent.⁽¹³⁾ In the 2005 spelling the stem remains unchanged by the addition of the diminutive suffix. Thus words such as *diner* are written the same way whether they contain a suffix or not.

The new spelling does not work out well in the case of hyphenated forms such as *depotje*: the form *depot-je* suggests the pronunciation [depojə] instead of [depocə]. Before 1995, the hyphenated form was *depot-tje* which does more justice to the pronunciation.

In the case of *skiester* the change is in the opposite direction: the old spelling ensured a consistent spelling of the stem, the new spelling does more justice to the pronunciation with a long vowel. The contrast between (3a) and (3b) illustrates that the recent spelling reforms do not aim at a spelling in which either the proper representation of the pronunciation or a constant spelling of morphological paradigms prevails. In 1954, the spelling of diminutives followed pronunciation.⁽¹⁴⁾ It still does in cases such as (3c).

Finally, apostrophes are no longer considered necessary for inflected and derived forms of acronyms which are pronounced as one word (so-called *letterwoorden* ‘letter words’): *havo’er* → *havoër* [havowər] ‘pupil of the *havo*, *hoger algemeen vormend onderwijs*, a type of school’. Instead, these words follow the rules for common words (a dieresis for digraph avoidance). An apostrophe is only used with acronyms which are pronounced letter by letter (so-called *initiaalwoorden* ‘initial words’): *vwo’er* [vewejowər] ‘pupil of the *vwo*, *voorbereidend wetenschappelijk onderwijs*, another type of school’, and with acronyms which are written with a capital: *FAQ’jes*,⁽¹⁵⁾ *Benelux’je* (GB 2005:94, 116).

-
- (13) Not all diminutive forms introduced in GB 1995 followed this strategy. For instance, the diminutives of *deux-chevaux* (2CV) and *pince-nez* (pince-nez) are *deux-chevauxtje* not **deux-chevootje*, and *pince-neztje*, not **pince-neetje*.
- (14) According to the prize-winning essay by SIEGENBEEK 1804, one of the founding fathers of present-day Dutch orthography, its relation to pronunciation should be fundamental. Accordingly, Te Winkel’s Phonological Principle has primacy over the Morphological Principle, and the 1954 reform aimed at a phonologically faithful ‘dutchification’ of inflected forms. The result is exemplified by the diminutives in the left-hand column of (3), *skister* being an exception that was only added in 1995. A principled approach is called for, in which either the paradigmatic uniformity of *diner* - *dinertje* etc. prevails, or compliance to pronunciation as in *ski* - *skiester*, *oma* - *omaatje*, etc. In other words, the hierarchical ordering of the Morphological and the Phonological Principle needs to be re-examined.
- (15) Cf. GB 2005:94. Observe that *FAQ’jes* should be *FAQ’tjes* for those who pronounce the word letter by letter. In Dutch diminutives, the allophony of the diminutive suffix is expressed in the spelling. Such variation will be the inevitable consequence of a spelling based on pronunciation. It is one of the aspects in which an abstract spelling is superior. See NEIJT & SCHREUDER (to appear) on the issue of variation of pronunciation and abstractness in alphabetic writing.

The verbal inflection of foreign words has been changed as well. Formerly, the spelling of a verb derived from a noun which ends in a silent *e* depended on its pronunciation (GB 1995:41). The *e* was only considered a part of the stem if it was needed to ensure the correct pronunciation: *leasde* versus *breakdancete* (*break-dancte* without the *e* suggests that the *c* is pronounced as [k] instead of [s]). The new spelling rules, however, refer to the English orthography:

- The stem of a verb of English origin is written the same way as in English. That form is used as the stem of a native verb.
(GB 2005:81)⁽¹⁶⁾

This rule means that the stem of an English loan verb like *leasen* is considered to be *lease*, even though verb stems ending in a silent *e* are alien to Dutch. As a consequence, that silent *e* is retained in inflected forms: *leasen* – *leasete*, *leasede* – *geleaset*, *geleased*. Since no similar rule is given for French words, their stems are identified exactly like those of native words, namely by removing the ending *-en* from the infinitive. Thus, the stem of *fonduen* is *fondue*, not *fondue*.

The results are differences between the spelling of French and English verb forms like those in (4).

(4)	noun	verb – 1995	verb – 2005	gloss
French	<i>fondue</i> 'fondue'	<i>fonduen</i>	<i>fonduen</i>	'to fondue'
		<i>ik fondue</i>	<i>ik fondu</i>	'I fondue'
		<i>fonduede</i>	<i>fondude</i>	past tense
		<i>gefondued</i>	<i>gefondueud</i>	past participle
English	<i>barbecue</i> 'barbecue'	<i>barbecuen</i> ⁽¹⁷⁾	<i>barbecueën</i>	'to barbecue'
		<i>ik barbecue</i>	<i>ik barbecue</i>	'I barbecue'
		<i>barbecueede</i>	<i>barbecueede</i>	past tense
		<i>gebarbecued</i>	<i>gebarbecued</i>	past participle
French	<i>douche</i> 'shower'	<i>douchen</i>	<i>douchen</i>	'to shower'
		<i>ik douche</i>	<i>ik douch</i>	'I shower'
		<i>douchte</i>	<i>douchte</i>	past tense
		<i>gedoucht</i>	<i>gedoucht</i>	past participle
English	<i>bridge</i> 'bridge'	<i>bridgen</i>	<i>bridgen</i>	'to play bridge'
		<i>ik bridge</i>	<i>ik bridge</i>	'I play bridge'
		<i>bridgede</i>	<i>bridgede, -ete</i>	past tense
		<i>gebridged</i>	<i>gebridged, -et</i>	past participle

(16) However, the stem of some English verbs had been dutchified already in 1995: *stressen*, *ik stres*/**stress*; *scoren*, *ik scoor*/**score* (GB 2005: 81).

(17) Since forms such as *fonduede* show that the stem is *fondue*, the infinitive should have been *fondueën* in the 1995 spelling. In *barbecuen*, which has antepenultimate stress, it can be assumed that the *e* is deleted after an unstressed syllable just as in *neuriën*.

No reason is given for the different treatment of English and French words. Moreover, this two-way approach misses the relevant point, which is the necessity of mute *e* for the grapheme-phoneme connection. Until 2005, the first person singular of the verb *douchen* ‘to shower’ was exceptionally spelled (*ik*) *douche*, because *douch* suggests the incorrect pronunciation [dux]. This is the only instance in the Dutch language where word-final *ch* after a vowel denotes [sj]. This case and similar ones have nothing to do with a word’s provenance. For instance, the verb *mimen* is derived from *pantomime* which has Greek roots. It presumably entered Dutch via French, not English. It seems appropriate, nevertheless, to treat it as an English word, for only then do we get *ik mime* ‘I mime’, and not *mim* which incorrectly suggests a lax vowel. In sum, the fine-grained new approach does not answer the core question of how to write inflected forms of stems with an irregular spelling. Te Winkel’s approach was to dutchify the final syllable of stems, in order to prevent such problems.

3.3. The use of spaces and hyphens

The main rules for the use of spaces and hyphens are:

- Write word groups as separate words (*academisch ziekenhuis* ‘academic hospital, university hospital’)
 - Write compounds and derivations as one word (*tuinstoel* ‘garden chair’, *onaf* ‘unfinished’)
 - Write special compounds and word groups with a hyphen (*pianiste-componiste* ‘female pianist and composer’)
- (GB 2005:35)

The first two rules are mere reformulations of old ones, but the third is new. It is only vaguely characterized as ‘special’. The example provided suggests that it refers exclusively to copulative compounds (those with a coordinative relation between the constituent parts rather than the more usual specifier-head relation), but examples in (7) below suggest that there is more to it than just that.

A number of spelling changes lead to the insertion or deletion of spaces, as illustrated in (5):

(5)	1995	2005	gloss
a	<i>honderdmiljoen</i> <i>eenderde</i>	<i>honderd miljoen</i> <i>een derde</i>	one hundred million a third
b	<i>doodwanen</i> <i>haringkaken</i>	<i>dood wanen</i> <i>haring kaken</i>	to presume dead to gut herring

c	<i>te voorschijn</i> <i>ter zijde</i>	<i>tevoorschijn</i> <i>terzijde</i>	out in the open (<i>as in</i> come ...) aside
d	<i>on line</i> <i>all risk</i> <i>bungee jumping</i>	<i>online</i> <i>allrisk</i> <i>bungeejumping</i>	on line all risks bungee jumping
e	<i>kortegolf</i> <i>compactdisc</i> <i>lowbudget</i>	<i>korte golf</i> <i>compact disc</i> <i>low budget</i>	short-wave compact disc low budget
f	<i>blue jeans</i>	<i>bluejeans</i>	blue jeans

The changes in (5a) follow from the new rules for numerals:

- We write a number as one word up to the number thousand. *Duizend* 'thousand' is followed by a space. The words *miljoen* 'million', *miljard* 'milliard', *biljoen* 'billion', etc. are written as separate words.
- Fractions are written with a space.
(GB 2005:48-49)

Changes like those in (5b) and (5c) reflect a different assessment of the status of these word combinations. Those in (5b) are henceforth treated as word groups rather than compound verbs, whereas those in (5c), which were formerly considered to be word groups, apparently are now classed as compound-like elements or unanalyzable phrases.⁽¹⁸⁾ The list in (5d) shows how frequently used English word groups and common English compounds must now be written without spaces, whereas English combinations with an adjective as left-hand member, as in (5e) are now generally considered to be a word group, although (5f) shows that not all instances of this kind are thus analysed.

Finally, a new rule for English words was introduced which does not lead to spelling changes since it applies to a class of words which is not present in the dictionary. Still, it is an interesting one: write English job names of three or more parts with spaces: *public relations officer* (GB 2005:80). Similar words in the dictionary which are not job names, or which contain a Dutch part, are written without spaces: *publicrelationsbureau*, *publicrelationsmedewerker*. Theoretically this rule could lead to contrasts such as *public relations officer* versus *publicrelationsoffice*.

(18) Admittedly, some frozen word groups are written as orthographic words, without spaces between the constituent words. Examples are *hogeschool* 'high school', *sterkedrank* 'liquor' and *weliswaar* 'however, admittedly' (lit. 'well+is+true'). However, such writing seems to be the exception rather than the rule. Examples of frozen word groups written with spaces are *vaste prik* 'business as usual', *hoge hoed* 'high hat', *op grond van* 'based on', and many, many others.

New rules have been designed for the use of hyphens. Generally these rules tend to diminish the use of hyphens since they were felt to occur all too frequently as it was, cf. VAN MAANEN (2006). One hotly debated instance concerns the fact that hyphens no longer represent the unity of word groups in compounds, when capital letters can be taken to signal the connection between words that form a name, as in *Tweede-Kamerlid* → *Tweede Kamerlid* ‘Member of the House of Commons’, derived from *Tweede Kamer* ‘House of Commons’, and *Rode-Kruispost* → *Rode Kruispost* ‘Red Cross post’ derived from *Rode Kruis* ‘Red Cross’.

Table (6) lists some other examples culled from the Green Booklet of words which lose their hyphens (GB 2005:35-50):

(6) 1995	2005	gloss
a <i>koude-oorlogsdenken</i> <i>langzaam-aan-actie</i>	<i>koudeoorlogsdenken</i> <i>langzaamaanactie</i>	cold war thinking go-slow
b <i>aids-afdeling</i> <i>lat-relatie</i> <i>petfles</i>	<i>aidsafdeling</i> <i>latrelatie</i> <i>petfles</i>	AIDS department LAT relationship PET bottle
c <i>co-assistent</i> <i>coauteur</i> <i>prowesters</i> <i>anti-westers</i>	<i>coassistent</i> <i>coauteur</i> <i>prowesters</i> <i>antiwesters</i>	intern co-author pro western anti western
d <i>sociaal-geografisch</i> <i>sociaal-geograaf</i>	<i>sociaalgeografisch</i> <i>sociaal geograaf</i>	human geography human geographer
e <i>amateur-boxer</i>	<i>amateurboxer</i>	amateur boxer

The examples in (6) illustrate word types which are no longer seen as “special compounds” which require the use of hyphens. They include compounds which contain embedded word groups like *koude oorlog* ‘cold war’, acronyms without capitals (*aids*, *lat*), words with Latinate prefixes (*co-*, *pro-*), compounds which are no longer considered to be coordinative since their order cannot be changed (GB 2005:38) and words with the adjunct *amateur*. Minor changes are the deletion of some hyphens which were borrowed from English: *have-not* (‘have not’) → *havenot*; *self-fulfilling prophecy* (‘self-fulfilling prophecy’) → *selffulfilling prophecy*.

Note that the words in (6a-c) used to be written inconsistently, and that these inconsistencies are resolved by the new spelling. On the other hand, a new inconsistency is introduced between *sociaalgeografisch* and *sociaal geograaf*. In a few cases like those in (7), the new rules add extra hyphens.

(7) 1995	2005	gloss
a <i>hink-stapsprong</i> <i>ups and downs</i> <i>mond- en klauwzeer</i>	<i>hink-stap-sprong</i> <i>ups-and-downs</i> <i>mond-en-klauwzeer</i>	hop, skip and jump ups and downs foot-and-mouth disease
b <i>meesterkok</i>	<i>meester-kok</i>	master chef
c <i>wijgevoel</i>	<i>wij-gevoel</i>	‘we-feeling’: sense of togetherness
d <i>onhollands</i> <i>medekamerlid</i> <i>transalpijns</i>	<i>on-Hollands</i> <i>mede-Kamerlid</i> <i>trans-Alpijns</i>	un-Dutch fellow member of Parliament transalpine
e <i>all in</i>	<i>all-in</i>	all in
f <i>ad(-)hocbeslissing</i> <i>haute(-)coutureshop</i>	<i>ad-hocbeslissing</i> <i>haute-coutureshop</i>	ad hoc decision haute couture shop

In (7), hyphens are required from 2005 onwards because we are dealing with “word groups which denote one concept” (GB 2005:44), compounds with the special adjunct *meester*-(19), compounds with cited word forms, compounds with capitalized forms, and English compounds with a preposition as their right-hand member(20). Also, compounds specified by a foreign word group are written with a hyphen, whereas the hyphen was optional according to the former spelling dictionary.

Another change concerns the use of hyphens to avoid vowel clash. In 1995, only the combination *i+i* was singled out as an instance for which a hyphen is needed in compounds, though no dieresis is needed in non-compounds (the compound case is exemplified by *anti-intellectueel* ‘anti intellectual’, GB 1995:32 and rebutted by *groeimpuls* ‘growing impulse’, GB 1995:352; examples of derived words are *kopiist* ‘one who copies’ and *eeneiig* ‘monovular, monozygotic’). The reformers of 2005 distinguish a new subtype of vowel clash (GB 2005:51): letter combinations that clash in compounds only. As such, they consider also combinations like *i+j*, *e+ij* and *e+ui*. Clash does occur, then, in compounds like *gummi-jas* ‘rubber coat’, *vanille-ij*s ‘vanilla ice cream’, *college-uitstap* ‘college trip’, but not in underived words or derivations like *bijectie* ‘bijection’, *beijveren* ‘advocate zealously’ and *geuit* ‘uttered’. Again, no reason is given for treating vowel clashes in compounds differently from vowel clashes elsewhere.

(19) *Meester* is added to the list of items which were already considered special adjuncts: *niet* ‘not’, *non* ‘non’, *bijna* ‘almost’, *oud* ‘former’, *ex* ‘ex’, *aspirant* ‘trainee, candidate’, *adjunct* ‘deputy, vice-’, *substituut* ‘substitute’, *chef* ‘chief’, *kandidaat* ‘candidate’, *interim* ‘interim’, *stagiair* ‘trainee’, *leerling* ‘apprentice’, *assistent* ‘assistant’, and *collega* ‘colleague’. As we saw in (6e), *amateur* is no longer part of this list (GB 2005:42).

(20) Exceptions to this last category are *pullover*, *countdown*, *breakdown*, *feedback* and *playback*.

Table (8) illustrates the effects of the new rules with respect to the former standard of 1995.

(8)	1995	2005	gloss
a	<i>groeimpuls</i>	<i>groeï-impuls</i>	growing impulse
b	<i>rij-instructeur</i>	<i>rijinstructeur</i>	driving instructor

Strictly speaking, there is no need for either a hyphen or a dieresis for *i+i* because the letter sequence can only be read one way: in Dutch *ii* cannot denote one sound.⁽²¹⁾ It seems that a ‘mistake’ in 1995 led to a more complicated approach of the issue in 2005. This more complex presentation of vowel clashes could have been avoided, because the use of hyphens at word boundaries in compounds is optional. The writers could thus decide for themselves whether or not the hyphen is needed.

Finally, the dictionary shows that changes have also been made to hyphenation for typographical purposes. These changes are not mentioned in the guidelines of the Green Booklet, only in the unpublished *Technische Handleiding* ‘Technical Guide’, and they have been implemented in the list of entries. In the first place the combination *sj* is now considered to be inseparable; no hyphen may be inserted between the two letters (a dot indicates where the word may be hyphenated): *koos.jer* → *koo.sjer* ‘kosher’, and *pas.ja* → *pa.sja* ‘pasha’. This change violates the principled approach to degemination of letters in Dutch, according to which the form *koo.sjer* is ruled out, because geminate vowel letters are degeminated at the end of a syllable. Therefore, *koo.sjer* should be replaced by *ko.sjer* as shown by *autootje* – *auto.tje*. The form *pa.sja* suggests the incorrect pronunciation [a] in the first syllable.

Secondly, words such as *roy.aal* ‘royal’ may be hyphenated in two ways, corresponding with two possible pronunciations *roy.aal* for the original French pronunciation [rwɑjal] where *oy* denote [wɑ], and *ro.yaal* for the dutchified pronunciation [rojal]. The strategy of 1954 was based on morphology and letter sequences, the new one is also based on pronunciation.⁽²²⁾

(21) The spelling rules state that optional hyphens may be used in compounds to clarify their meaning, so the spelling *rij-instructeur* is still possible (GB 2005:36, 53, 78). These optional variants are not included in the dictionary.

(22) The following example also illustrates the fact that pronunciation has been a guiding principle of the new hyphenation rules. In the first version of the dictionary, *Frankrijk* ‘France’ was hyphenated as *Fran.krijk* because of the pronunciation [frɑŋ–krɛɪk]. However, the word *rijk* ‘kingdom’ can be recognized in this frozen compound. In such cases the morphological structure used to override the pronunciation, e.g. *heel.al* ‘universe, whole + all’ with the pronunciation [he–lɑl]. The form *Fran.krijk* was corrected in the errata.

3.4. The use of capital letters

The longest chapter of the new guidelines, good for nearly one fifth of the total length of the text, is devoted to the use of lower and upper case. Among other things, it introduces a new spelling principle, the so-called Donor Principle:

The Donor Principle

- Respect the spelling of the donor language or the spelling chosen by the founder, designer or owner of an institution or brand.
(GB 2005:1044)

Applied generally, this principle would lead to the spelling *London*, *København* and *Paris* instead of the traditional forms *Londen*, *Kopenhagen* and *Parijs*. This presumably is not intended. The principle only seems to hold for the use of capitals and abbreviations, and it seems to apply only to titles of newspapers and magazines and the like (*de Volkskrant*; *Het Parool*; *BN/de Stem*; *AD*; *KIJK*) and organizations (*BuZa* ‘Foreign Affairs, *Buitenlandse Zaken*’, *PvdA* ‘Labour Party, *Partij van de Arbeid*’). Note that the use of upper and lower case in such forms is often a matter of aesthetic preferences of the owners.⁽²³⁾

The set of nine rules for the use of lower and upper case of 1995 has evolved into a set of 21, the core of which consists of three rules which distinguish between proper nouns (*Shakespeare*), common nouns (*drama*), derivations (*shakespeareaans* ‘Shakespearean’) and compounds (*Shakespeareadrama*):

- Proper names are written with a capital letter; common names are written in lower case.
- Derivations of proper names are written in lower case.
- Compounds with a proper name are written with a capital letter, but lower case is used when the person mentioned is not involved in the new concept.
(GB 2005:96-98)

The proviso “when the person mentioned is not involved in the new concept” is illustrated by examples such as *Beatlesplaat* - *beatlehaar* ‘record made by The Beatles’ versus ‘hair like The Beatles’, and *Hitlerretoriek* - *molotovcocktail* ‘the way Adolf Hitler spoke’ versus ‘petrol bomb, named after Soviet minister Molotov’.

The general rules for derivations and compounds are new. The former dictionary contained only a general rule for personal names in compounds and derivations, which should not be written with capital letters, and a general rule for

(23) The status of the Donor Principle is unclear. It is less prominent in the unpublished version of the guidelines (the *Technische Handleiding*) than in the *Groene Boekje*.

words derived from geographical names, which should be written with capital letters. This latter rule is present in the new guidelines as one of the additional or exceptional rule sets based on semantic or etymological classes of words. These are geographical names, languages, peoples, periods of time, holidays, religions or movements, organisations, brand names, titles, expressions of respect, names based on functions, holy names, and German words (GB 2005:95). In the former dictionary, the spellings of such classes were handled in only two pages.

The older prescriptions were vague or incomplete, and led to what one might consider inconsistencies, such as the ones in (9).

(9) 1995	2005	gloss
a names in derivations <i>Victoriaans</i> <i>orwelliaans</i>	<i>victoriaans</i> <i>orwelliaans</i>	Victorian Orwellian
b names of inventors in compounds <i>Lorentz-kracht</i> <i>vanderwaalskrachten</i>	<i>lorentzkracht</i> <i>vanderwaalskrachten</i>	Lorentz force Van der Waals forces
c names in compounds with a weak link to the person <i>Salomonsoordeel</i> <i>oedipuscomplex</i>	<i>salomonsoordeel</i> <i>oedipuscomplex</i>	Solomon's judgment, Oedipus conflict
d brand titles <i>elfstedentocht</i> <i>oscar</i> <i>Nobelprijs</i>	<i>Elfstedentocht</i> <i>Oscar</i> <i>Nobelprijs</i>	Eleven cities tour Oscar Nobel Prize
e periods of time <i>Ramadan</i> <i>vastentijd</i>	<i>ramadan</i> <i>vastentijd</i>	Ramadan Lent
f historical events <i>boerenoorlog</i> <i>anjerrevolutie</i> <i>Contrareformatie</i>	<i>Boerenoorlog</i> <i>Anjerrevolutie</i> <i>Contrareformatie</i>	Boer War Portuguese revolution of 1974 Counter Reformation
g organisations <i>veiligheidsraad</i> <i>senaatscommissie</i> <i>Tweede Kamer</i>	<i>Veiligheidsraad</i> <i>Senaatscommissie</i> <i>Tweede Kamer</i>	Security Council Senate Committee Lower House
h German nouns <i>Götterdämmerung</i> <i>Übermensch</i> <i>aha-erlebnis</i>	<i>götterdämmerung</i> <i>übermensch</i> <i>aha-erlebnis</i>	Gotterdammerung Uebermensch aha-Erlebnis

The larger set of rules aims to prevent such inconsistencies. Over 300 words changed, one third in the direction of lower case, the others in the direction of upper case [Overzicht 2005]. A set of examples illustrating the complexity of the issue is given in (10):

(10)	1995	2005	gloss
a	official holidays <i>nieuwjaar</i>	<i>Nieuwjaar</i>	New Year's Day
	non-official holidays <i>Palmzondag</i>	<i>palmzondag</i>	Palm Sunday
b	holy persons <i>kerstman</i>	<i>Kerstman</i>	Father Christmas
	<i>sinterklaas</i>	<i>Sinterklaas/sinterklaas</i> ⁽²⁴⁾	St. Nicholas
	<i>boeddhabbeeld</i>	<i>Boeddhabbeeld</i>	Buddha statue
	holy books <i>bijbel</i>	<i>Bijbel</i>	bible (the text)
	copy of holy book <i>bijbel</i>	<i>bijbel</i>	bible (a copy of)
c	acronyms <i>BTW</i>	<i>btw</i>	VAT
	<i>pc</i>	<i>pc</i>	pc
	<i>aids</i> ⁽²⁵⁾	<i>aids</i>	AIDS
	exceptions because of Donor Principle	<i>ADSL</i> <i>GmbH</i>	English loan German loan
	current governmental terms	<i>WAO</i> <i>AMvB</i>	abbr. for law providing for disabled workers abbr. for the equivalent of an Order in Council
	illnesses	<i>BSE</i> <i>ME</i>	English loan English loan

(24) GB 2005 contains two forms for the two uses of St. Nicholas: *Sinterklaas* for the mythical bishop, friend and benefactor of all children, who comes from Spain each year and rides the rooftops in early December, doling out gifts and *sinterklaas* for the many stand-ins who dress up as Sinterklaas, and sit in shops or make house calls on 5 December. There is, however, only one form for *Kerstman*.

(25) Actually, the new rules for acronyms are less straightforward. Capitals are still used (a) when they denote a name: *Unicef*. Acronyms of fewer than four letters and acronyms of four letters which denote a public institution, union or political party are written with capitals only (but cf. *Sdu* for 'Staatsdrukkerij en -uitgeverij', *PvdA* 'Partij van de Arbeid'). (b) Capitals are used when they occur in the donor language, and the acronym is not considered common. Examples are English *RAM*, *ADSL*, or German *GmbH* (the capitals in the acronym remain although we no longer write German nouns with capitals). (c) Capitals are used when the acronym denotes a law, resolution or government scheme *VUT*, *WAO* (exceptions are possible under the Donor Principle: *AMvB*, *Wajong*). (c) And finally, capitals are used when they denote an illness: *BSE*, *ME* (unless the acronym is considered common: *aids*).

Large sets of exceptions are formulated. For instance, one should not use capitals for names of people, objects and languages when the name is:

(11) exceptional use of lower case for persons			gloss
a	practitioners of a religion	<i>protestant</i>	Protestant
		<i>jood</i>	Jew
b	derogatory	<i>aussie</i>	Aussie
		<i>jap</i>	Jap
		<i>eskimo</i>	Eskimo ‘frigid person’
c	not based on place of the origin, but on the features of the object	<i>neanderthaler</i>	Neanderthal
		<i>edammer</i>	Edam cheese
		<i>parmaham</i>	Parma ham
		<i>alpenviooltje</i>	Alpine Violet (actually a cyclamen)
d	a subjective way of mentioning a language	<i>steenkolenengels</i>	coal English (i.e. Dutchglish)

Note that these exceptions are motivated by subjective or subtle semantic distinctions, which may vary according to the context. Moreover, it is not clear which rule should take precedence in cases of conflict. For instance, derivations and compounds from geographical names retain their capital letters: *een New Yorker* ‘someone from New York’, *het Plat-New Yorks* ‘broad dialect spoken in New York’, but *belgicisme* ‘Belgianism’ follows the main rule for derivations, because the word does not refer to the place of origin, but to an *-ism* with the features of Belgium (GB 2005:101).

4. Evaluation of the spelling reform

We will now evaluate the effects of the reform in view of the spelling system and from the perspective of Dutch readers and writers. Are the basic characteristics of the Dutch spelling system still in sync with the principles that constitute the foundation of Dutch orthography according to De Vries and Te Winkel? Has the spelling been simplified? And has the spelling reform provided the full coverage and explicitness it set out to achieve?

4.1 The spelling principles

A natural starting point for the evaluation are the basic spelling principles of Dutch. These were first formulated by TE WINKEL (1863, 1865) and adapted in the spelling dictionary of DE VRIES & TE WINKEL (1866). These principles are generally known

as the Phonological Principle, the Morphological Principle, and the Etymological Principle. From 1866 until 2005, these formed the basis for modern Dutch spelling, notwithstanding the amendments of 1947, 1954 and 1995 (NUNN 1998:3). Even though the spelling law of 2005 is no longer formally based on the principles by De Vries and Te Winkel, the new dictionary contains statements which may be considered to be instances of them.⁽²⁶⁾

The first and most prominent principle is the Phonological Principle. Its old and new formulations are as follows:

The Phonological Principle

- Represent by means of letters all the constituent parts that are heard in a word when it is pronounced correctly by civilized people. Choose the closest match of letters in case the correct pronunciation cannot be expressed. (TE WINKEL 1865:43)
- A word is spelled with the sounds heard in the standard pronunciation of that word. (GB 2005:16)

The formulation of this principle has been changed between 1865 and 2005, but not its meaning. Also, it continues to be obeyed in almost all cases. A few changes, however, result in written words that do no longer accurately describe the pronunciation.

Diminutives of French loan words in a silent *t* are a case in point. The former spelling contained *colbert* – *colbertje* – *col.bert.je*, *depot* – *depootje* – *de.pot.tje*, and *biscuit* – *biscuittje* – *bis.cuit.tje*. The basic words are pronounced without the final *t*. The diminutive forms are in accordance with the pronunciation, but one of the hyphenated forms, *colbert.je*, wrongly suggests that the *t* is not pronounced. The new spelling changed *depootje* → *depotje* and *biscuittje* → *biscuitje*, with the hyphenated forms *de.pot.je* and *bis.cuit.je*. These also suggest that the third syllable is pronounced without a *t*. Moreover, the new form *depotje* suggests that [ɔ] is pronounced rather than [o].

Secondly, in some cases the spelling either corresponds to one of the possible pronunciations only, or suggests an incorrect pronunciation altogether. For instance, the word *affiche* ‘poster’ is pronounced with a final schwa, cf. HEEMSKERK & ZONNEVELD (2000). The diminutive form is therefore predicted to be *affichetje*, just like *dame* – *dametje* ‘lady – little lady’. However, only the diminutive *afficheje* is listed in the dictionary, which implies that *affiche* is pronounced with a silent vowel. If possible at all, *afficheje* should have been given next to the more normal form

(26) In the editions 1995 and 2005 of the *Groene Boekje*, the spelling principles are less prominent than before. Earlier spelling dictionaries referred to the *Grondbeginselen*, ‘Fundamentals’, a book of more than 200 pages (TE WINKEL 1865). The spelling dictionary of 2005 deals with the principles in only two pages.

affichetje. Another example of this kind is formed by the pair *giraffe* and *giraffetje* ‘little giraffe’. These spellings show that two variants exist, *giraf* and *giraffe*. One would therefore also expect two possible spellings for compounds with this word. However, both in 1995 and in 2005 only one variant has been chosen, and without further comments, the spelling changed from *giraffehals* into *giraffenhals* ‘giraffe neck’. This means that compounds are assumed to be formed from the variant *giraf* only (which has a plural form *-en*, not *-s*), and not from the variant *giraffe* which has two plural forms, *giraffen* and *giraffes*.

The second principle is called the Morphological Principle. We present both the original version of 1865 and the new, simplified one, which captures the essence of the principle, but with omissions:

The Morphological Principle

- Write a word with the same letters as far as pronunciation and flexion allow. Assign to a derived word’s base and its constituent parts as far as pronunciation allows the form that is used outside the derivation or the compound word. But notice that this principle holds only for instances in which the meaning of the form used in isolation is similar to the meaning of the constituent parts of a complex word. (TE WINKEL 1865:19)
- Preferably use the same spelling for a word or a part of a word. (GB 2005:16)

The first omission concerns meaning. The old formulation strives for congruent spelling of linguistic constituents with similar meanings only, hence no *ds* in *Duits* ‘German’ and *diets* ‘duidelijk’ which are morphologically related to *duid* and *died*, older words for ‘folk’ (TE WINKEL 1865:20).

The second omission arises from doing away with the caveat “as far as pronunciation allows”. With it, it was clear that the Phonological Principle was paramount, the Morphological Principle unambiguously subordinate. Without it, there is no clear hierarchy.

In our 1997 overview we used the name Readability Principle for this part of the former Morphological Principle, because in effect it restricts congruency to those cases that are in accordance with the spelling-speech relation. By using this name we wanted to emphasize the importance of the relation between letters and sounds for the reader. Even though De Vries and Te Winkel did not present it as a principle, they took care of Readability. The new formulation of the Morphological Principle and the examples discussed above (diminutives such as *depotje* and *afficheje*, and hyphenated forms of diminutives) show that Readability is no longer considered an essential aspect of orthography.

Some aspects of the new spelling prescriptions make the spelling of morphemes more constant than it was. We already discussed the new more regular spelling of *paardenbloem*. The deletion of the fauna-flora rule results in a uniform spelling for all compounds with [pa:rdə(n)] as first element. Minor inconsistencies

of the 1995 spelling have been solved such as *dronkenlap* ‘drunkard’ ↔ *dronkeman* ‘drunkard’ (now *dronkenman*), and there is an endeavour to solve inconsistencies of the c/k type, cf. *fabrikaat* → *fabriicaat*. These efforts remain inconsistent, however, as long as no general strategy is developed.

Similarly, the abolishment of the dutchified spelling of diminutives (*diner*, *dineetje* → *dinertje*) keeps the spelling more in line with the Morphological Principle. But observe that such forms give a less accurate representation of the pronunciation, as does the base word *diner*. Moreover, this new treatment of diminutives is in conflict with the way other forms are dealt with, such as *café* – *cafeetje*. Consequently, the rule of thumb “dutchify the syllable before the diminutive suffix” is no longer reliable, and language users need to follow a word-by-word strategy.

One of the issues raised by the 2005 reform is the domain of the Morphological Principle: does it also restrict the use of capitalization? The answer seems to be negative, given that there are many instances in which a proper name embedded in a derived word is written with small letters. There are so many exceptions however, that one may doubt the validity of this rule. The inconsistency of the present guidelines is illustrated in (12). Capital letters carry over to compounds and derivations in geographical names. In the case of personal names they carry over to compounds only, and they do not carry over at all in the case of holidays:

(12)	base word	compound	derivation
a	<i>Nederland</i> ‘The Netherlands’	<i>Nederlandkunde</i> ‘Dutch studies’ <i>Noord-Nederland</i> ‘north of the Netherlands’	<i>Nederlands</i> ‘Dutch (adj.)’ <i>on-Nederlands</i> ‘un-Dutch’
b	<i>Rembrandt</i> ‘Rembrandt’	<i>Rembrandtjaar</i> ‘Rembrandt Year’	<i>rembrandtesk</i> ‘Rembrandtian’
c	<i>Nieuwjaar</i> ‘New Year’s Day’	<i>nieuwjaarsdag</i> ‘New Year’s Day’	<i>nieuwjaarachtig</i> ‘New Year-ish’

In geographical names the Morphological Principle is best obeyed. However, even here counterexamples exist (or perhaps these are mistakes): *Amerikaans*, *anti-Amerikaans*, but *anti-amerikanisme*, and *amerikaniseren*.

The final principle is the Etymological Principle. Its old and new formulation are as follows:

The Etymological Principle

- The choice between competing spellings for one sound is determined by the derivation or by the older form that was used when pronunciations that are now identical could still be distinguished clearly. (TE WINKEL 1865:22)
- The spelling of a word is determined sometimes by its origin. (GB 2005:17)

Te Winkel's formulation refers to homophones such as *hei* 'heather' and *hij* 'he', that are distinguished on the basis of older stages of Dutch. In actual fact, he used the principle in the wider sense intended by the new Green Booklet, to include the spelling of ill-fitting loan words, but he did not degrade it into the meaningless 'sometimes' of today's formula. Te Winkel meant to dutchify those loan words that were used by lay men, i.e. words that are needed to describe everyday life. Hence, *insekt* is written with *k* whereas *object* is not.

The new spelling guidelines offer a mixed approach, which is most obvious in the spelling of the loan verbs *cruisen* and *leasen*. On the one hand their spelling is made more foreign by choosing the English stem with a silent *e*. On the other hand by allowing two variants with *d* or *t* (*leasete* or *leasede* and *cruisede* or *cruisete*) the spelling reflects the adaptation of the pronunciation to the Dutch linguistic system. Similarly, *sexappeal* (former spelling *sex-appeal*) is dutchified in that it is written as one word, but the *x* is not replaced by *ks* as in words such as *seks* and *seksualiteit*. Such inconsistencies stem from the lack of an overall view on the spelling of loan words.

The status of the new Donor Principle is unclear. It seems that this principle overlaps with the Etymological Principle. More information about how to apply the principles is needed.

4.2. Evaluation from the perspective of writers

Spelling changes are always inconvenient from the perspective of readers and writers because they have to get used to new representations in their mental lexicon (REITSMA 1983, VERHOEVEN 1985 and FRISSE & SANDRA 2002). Readers are less efficient in recognizing unknown forms (e.g. homophones such as *teid* instead of *tijd* 'time', BOSMAN & VAN HELL 2002). The inconvenience may be compensated for by a general simplification of the spelling or by spelling problems being resolved. In the case of the 2005 reform, the changes in the spelling rules aimed at taking away real or apparent contradictions between the rules and their application in the dictionary and at providing guidelines where they were missing. This would be an improvement for writers. So was the reform successful in this respect?

First let us assess whether the spelling has become more consistent and whether the rules have become simpler for the writer. According to DAEMS (2006:2) consistency means that words are spelled uniformly in the sense of the Morphological Principle and written the same way when formed in a similar manner. He calls this analogy (DAEMS 2006:4), which is not the same as the Principle of Analogy that Te Winkel once defined for Dutch orthography. Te Winkel invoked analogy for 'zero' morphology, morphemes which are not pronounced, such as *t* in *hij wordt* 'he becomes' and *s* in *stationsstraat* 'station street'. The *dt* is written in verbs with stems in *d* where the ending *t* is pronounced and

written in verbs not ending in *-d* (e.g. *hij hoort* from the stem *hoor*; therefore, analogously *hij wordt* from the stem *word*); the *ss* is written in *stationsstraat* ‘station street’ because the linking *s* is pronounced in other compounds with *station-*, such as *stationsweg* ‘station road’. Daems’ analogy is a more general tendency towards similarity of forms, which is quite difficult to obtain in writing, because analogy with one form often conflicts with possible analogies to other forms. As pointed out above, the new spelling rules created many violations of this more loose kind of analogy between similar words. Table (13) shows some of this.

(13) Contrasts between ‘similar’ words after 2005

Conflicting pairs	Cause of conflict
<i>cross-over</i> ↔ <i>pullover</i> <i>reïncarneren</i> ↔ <i>re-integreren</i>	Transparent ↔ opaque form
<i>ideeënrijk</i> ↔ <i>ideeëloos</i>	Set of exceptions
<i>meester-kok</i> ↔ <i>meesterbrein</i> <i>oud-gevangene</i> ↔ <i>oudgast</i>	<i>Meester</i> and <i>oud</i> trigger hyphens only when considered special adjuncts ⁽²⁷⁾
<i>hodgkin</i> ↔ <i>Stradivarius</i>	Illness versus object of creative art
<i>T-shirt</i> ↔ <i>tl-buis</i>	Capital letter reflects / does not reflect actual shape directly
<i>café – cafeetje</i> ↔ <i>diner – dinertje</i>	Dutchification in diminutive <i>versus</i> Donor Principle
<i>haute-couturewinkel</i> ↔ <i>publicrelationsmedewerker</i>	Hyphen in some foreign word groups only
<i>cliënteel</i> ↔ <i>clientèle</i> <i>patiënt</i> ↔ <i>patience</i>	Diacritics according to Dutch or foreign standards
<i>de douche, ik douch</i> ↔ <i>leasen, ik lease</i>	English <i>versus</i> French loan words
<i>volleyballen, ik volleybal</i> ↔ <i>baseballen, ik baseball</i>	Dutch <i>versus</i> English pronunciation of <i>bal</i> , [bal]

In many instances, it is unclear which variant should be considered to follow the main rule and which one is an exception. Rules have been designed for small classes of words, defined by subtle criteria. Writers need to take these criteria into account, which relate to transparency of the morphological structure of words, French or English origin, subtle pronunciation differences and knowledge of the world which

(27) *Meester* and *oud* are only special adjuncts when they mean ‘master’ and ‘former’, respectively. In *meesterbrein* “the meaning of *meester* is weakened” (GB 2005:42), and *oudgast* does not mean ‘former guest’, but has an idiosyncratic meaning ‘someone who lived in *Indonesia*’.

is quite often irrelevant for the proper use of a word. For instance, one may know perfectly well what a *tl-buis* ‘strip light’ is, without knowing what *t* and *l* stand for, and one may deeply understand what a *T-shirt* is, without realising that *T* stands for its general shape, like the *U* in *U-turn*. Many language users find all that irrelevant, and conclude that the differences in (13) simply prove the inconsistency of the new spelling⁽²⁸⁾.

The above argument holds for laymen and lexicographers alike, as shown by discrepancies between words or between the rules and words in the dictionary shown in (14), some of which have been corrected (cf. *Erratalijst* 2006).

(14) words	violated rule
<i>neestem(mer)</i> ‘nay vote(r)’ (corrected as <i>nee-stem(mer)</i>), <i>neecampagne</i> ‘no campaign’ (cf. <i>ja-knikken</i> ‘yes nodding’)	Hyphen follows cited word form
<i>drievierde</i> ‘three fourth’, <i>vijsachtste</i> ‘five eighths’ (corrected as <i>drie vierde</i> , <i>vijsachtste</i>)	Fractions are written with a space
<i>allrisk</i> , <i>bluejeans</i> (cf. <i>all right</i> , <i>compact disc</i>)	Combinations with an adjective as their left-hand member are word groups
<i>mijn en dijn</i> (cf. <i>ditjes-en-datjes</i>)	String-on words require hyphens
<i>vutter</i> (cf. <i>VUT</i> , <i>WAO’er</i>)	Capitals and apostrophe for derivation of acronym with capitals
<i>Cockney</i> , <i>Lap</i> , <i>Spanjool</i>	No capital in names of languages or peoples with a derogatory meaning ⁽²⁹⁾

Furthermore, words such as *up-to-date* and *service-volley* are said to require a hyphen because of the spelling of the donor language, but *up-to-date* is variably written with or without hyphens in English (COBUILD 1995:1848), and *service-volley* with a hyphen seems not to occur. Such errors show that the new spelling rules are too complex. They rely too much on other languages and on extralinguistic knowledge to be properly applied even by lexicographers.

(28) Even when the so-called inconsistency is due to a rule that can be used consistently, as is the case in *havoër* and *vwo’er*. Such examples show that one expects that two closely related words are spelled the same way.

(29) But notice that judgments vary. One may use *Cockney* etc. non derogatorily, as well as one may use the form *Aussie*, dubbed derogatory by the dictionary, as a jocular nickname for people from Australia. The form *Jappen* may be used simply as a shortened, colloquial form of *Japanners* ‘Japanese’ in Dutch.

Greater consistency has been achieved partly at the cost of increased complexity of the rules. This is most clear in the case of the rules for spaces, hyphens and capitals. However, this is no reason for concern to the spelling task force, since the rules capture the spelling system, and are not spelling strategies (DAEMS 2006:2). The task force expects writers to write by analogy and by memorizing words, not by the application of rules. Observe, however, that memorizing is an option only for forms that are met and remembered, not for unknown forms that do not occur often in writing. For analogy to work, the rules should at least show unequivocally which words or parts of words are to be considered similar. In natural language, there is a tendency towards uniformity of morphological paradigms; similar patterns should be available in writing in order to set analogy at work for readers and writers. In the absence of such patterns, the examples in (13) are straightforward inconsistencies. Furthermore, this list of errata shows that even lexicographers are in doubt about which rule or which analogy to choose. The conclusion must be that Dutch orthography became more complex due to the 2005 reform.

The spelling reform of 2005 was largely motivated by the desire for more explicitness and fuller coverage. To this end many rules, with sub-rules and exceptions were introduced, especially concerning the use of hyphens and capitals. These rules are not completely successful. In the first place, making rules explicit and more complete is only an advantage if the new rules are formulated adequately with respect to correctness and practicability. There are a number of cases where the spelling rules, changed or unchanged, were formulated incorrectly. We already pointed that out for the spelling of the linking *e(n)*, but there are other cases too. Changes such as *aërodynamica* → *aerodynamica*, for instance, were made on the grounds that there is no dieresis in purely foreign words. That may be true in *museum* and *paella*, but words like *laïceren*, *judaïca* and *octaëder* form counter-examples. The real issue is that the dieresis in *aero-* should not be there, because it does not mark a syllable.

Quite apart from all this, there remain some unanswered questions: what are the guidelines for new loan words? What about names embedded in the names of streets? Do we write *iets extraas* or *iets extra's* ('something extra, a bonus'; the former spelling is given in [Van Dale 2005])? The rules still do not cover all areas of uncertainty.

Further problems with the new rules are the apparent and real inconsistencies mentioned in (13) above, plus:

- I. The contradictory instructions for names and abbreviations: Donor Principle versus explicit rules.
- II. The use of vague concepts such as "common words", "occasional loans", and "words which denote one concept" (cf. the introduction of the notion *samenkoppelingen* 'string-on words').

- III. Too much semantic/pragmatic knowledge is still required, like whether the name of a language or a people is derogatory, or whether a holiday is official or not.

In addition, the rules use many new distinctions which are arbitrary and not (linguistically) motivated. For instance: why should English compounds that refer to job names not be written as compounds? Why should the names of inventors and discoverers be singled out to lose their capitals in a compound? Such distinctions do not play a role elsewhere in the language system. In this respect they are comparable to the fauna-flora rule. This rule also was based on meaning distinctions that play no role in the morphology and phonology of Dutch, and for this reason are better not expressed in writing.

A fundamental problem with the present reform is the fact that the new rules don't allow for flexibility. Whether or not a given word is treated like a proper or common name and whether or not it is meant as a derogatory phrase, depends on the context, and thus is subject to variation. Whether or not certain forms are morphologically transparent or opaque, often depends on the actual knowledge of individual language users (for instance, people with or without knowledge of classical languages). The Etymological Principle, now strengthened by the introduction of the Donor Principle, relies on knowledge not available to everyone. Moreover, the application of these principles is subject to debate, because words travel all over the world, and thus a word of Swahili origin may enter into Dutch via German, French, English or whatnot.

The current reform aims at a spelling system without variation, maybe as a reaction to half a century of spelling chaos related to the variable use of case endings (solved in 1947) and half a century of experimentation with spelling variants for hybrid words (the so-called preferred and allowed spelling; brought to an end by the 1995 reform). It seems that a proper balance still must be found between strict rules for the core of the system and sufficient room for variation dependent on context, style, genre and participants.⁽³⁰⁾

4.3. Evaluation from the perspective of readers

We have seen that the rules for hyphens, spaces and capitals have become quite complex, with many additional rules and rule-divisions. This means that the spelling

(30) Core and periphery need to be distinguished empirically. Presumably, the choice of letters and the couplings between letters and sounds belong to the core, and all the rest (capitals, abbreviations) is periphery. Relevant data can be found in psycholinguistic experiments like those described in SCHREUDER ET AL. 1998, BOSMAN & VAN HELL 2002, FRISSON & SANDRA 2002, VAN HEUVEN 2002, etc. Such experiments could shed light upon the effects of variation in spelling on the efficiency of reading as well.

reform is not a simplification for writers, let alone for those who are learning to write.⁽³¹⁾ So how about the readers? Do they profit from the new rules?

The fact that Readability is no longer mentioned in the guidelines of GB 2005 shows that the perspective of the reader is no longer taken into account.⁽³²⁾ There is only one word that received a more readable spelling, i.e. *skiester* instead of *skister*, which incorrectly suggested a short vowel *i*. On the other hand, many words are now less readable, as table (15) testifies.

(15) spelling	problem for the reader
<i>ik douch</i>	<i>ch</i> in this context suggests the pronunciation [x] rather than [sj]
<i>cruis<u>e</u>de, din<u>e</u>rtje</i>	suggest that the <i>e</i> and <i>r</i> are pronounced
<i>would-beschrijver</i>	suggests <i>would</i> + <i>beschrijver</i> ‘would + describer’ instead of ‘would-be + writer’
<i>10 eurobiljetten</i>	ambiguous: ‘10 euro-bills’ or ‘bills of 10 euro’? ⁽³³⁾
<i>sociaal psycholoog</i>	ambiguous: ‘sociable psychologist’ or ‘practitioner

(31) Observe that we evaluate the complexity of the spelling system in terms of numbers of rules and numbers of basic distinctions within these rules. Our conclusion differs from VERHOEVEN (2007:34), who claims that the new spelling will be easier to learn in certain respects, because there are fewer exceptions. We agree that a set of rules without exceptions will be easier to learn than the same set of rules plus a number of exceptions. However, the spelling of 2005 added rules but did not succeed in eliminating the exceptions. We think that a system of coherent general guidelines which allow for variation in areas that are difficult to express in alphabetic writing, will be easier to learn and use than a less coherent system with many detailed rules. In other words, we think that where no coherent treatment is available, some room for variation is to be preferred over strict regulation. Of course, empirical evidence is needed.

(32) Readability is mentioned, however, in the unpublished *Technische Handleiding* to motivate (a) dutchification of *hij skiet* (from: *skit*); (b) the use of dots in some abbreviations; and (c) the optional insertion of hyphens between the words of a compound.

(33) The advantage of writing compounds as words, without spaces, is that it expresses scope distinctions. Pronunciation makes you wonder about the interpretation of *you’ve got only ten* in Bob Dylan’s text about the man in the trenchcoat who wants eleven dollar bills. In Dutch orthography, the difference between *vuilegrondaffaire* ‘affair about dirty soil’ and *vuile grondaffaire* ‘nasty affair about land’ can be expressed in writing. Observe that this strategy may also prevent garden paths. The multiply ambiguous sentences *time flies like an arrow* and *fruit flies like a banana* would lose some of their many interpretations if the first two words, if and only if interpreted as a compound, were written as *timeflies*, as can be done with *fruitflies*. The English way of spelling compounds is notoriously difficult for technological language applications, cf. ISABELLE & BOURBEAU (1985:21). The Dutch way of spelling compounds is superior in this respect.

<i>rijinstructeur</i> <i>appel</i>	of social psychology’? ambiguous: <i>ij-i</i> or <i>i-ji</i> (cf. <i>mini-jihad</i>) with stress on <i>e</i> , meaning ‘roll call’ or ‘appeal’, is now a homograph of <i>appel</i> ‘apple’
---------------------------------------	--

In conclusion, there is no discernable improvement from the perspective of readers.⁽³⁴⁾

5. Conclusion

By way of conclusion, we will compare the 2005 reform to its predecessor of 1995. The evaluation of the changes in the previous section can be summarized as follows:

problems solved in 2005

1. update of dictionary, and correction of errors and inconsistencies introduced in 1995;
2. uniformity among dictionaries (no longer Green Spelling versus Red Spelling);
3. demise of the fauna-flora rule, which violated the Morphological Principle;
4. wider coverage through rules for more aspects of spelling.

problems created in 2005

1. new errors and inconsistencies arise;
2. a new alternative spelling was provoked (Green Spelling versus White Spelling);
3. new violations crept in of the Morphological Principle and the Phonological Principle;
4. readability of some forms deteriorated (*Tweede Kamerlid*, *dinertje*, *pa-sja*);

(34) VERHOEVEN (2007:38) concludes that pros and cons are balanced. He claims that the differences are small, and that the new spelling is simpler for the writer and more difficult for the reader. In our opinion, the spelling of 2005 illustrates better than the spelling of 1995 a new approach towards the relation between spoken and written forms. The spelling law of 2005 marks the demise of spelling along the lines set out by De Vries and Te Winkel, not just because of the cancellation of the old law that referred to their book on basic principles. More importantly, the new spelling no longer aims at formulating general principles, from which the detailed rules are derived and which offer a solid base for choosing among variants. Instead, the slogan “a problem with a solution is no longer a problem” (*Een probleem met een oplossing is geen probleem meer*, title of an interview with the secretary of the Taalunie, Linde van den Bosch, *de Standaard* October 17, 2005) illustrates the new approach: detailed rules, no principled method to handle fundamental issues, different types of consistency within small sets of words.

5. complexity increased (especially concerning the use of capitals, but also through subspecification of the Etymological Principle for the languages French and English)
6. flexibility decreased, especially in the use of capitals, hyphens and spaces.

When we compare this overview to the overview of problems solved and created by the 1995 reform (cf. section 2 above), the similarities and differences between both reforms are immediately apparent. In both cases problems were solved, but at the same time new problems were created. Neither reform addresses the main spelling problems of hybrid words and verb spelling, nor the intricate issue of handling the principles.

Notice that in 1995 major spelling issues were taken on, which affected many words. In contrast, the reforms of 2005 were much ado about fairly little, since despite all the hubbub only minor issues were addressed. From a professional, purely linguistic point of view, they were also certainly less fortuitous, and the former more fundamental approach to spelling in terms of principles is a clear loss of stability.

As regards the general public, many among them found the recent reforms less acceptable, partly because they came only ten years after the major overhaul of 1995, partly because they expected no real changes – they trusted the Taalunie, which had insisted time and time again that there would be no changes. On the other hand, repeated reforms may wear out resisters. If so, it comes with a serious drawback. For it implies that people are becoming indifferent about spelling and no longer bother to learn the new rules.

In the final analysis, neither reform attained its goal of establishing the idea that Dutch orthography improved. Both failed to adequately explain new rules and the reason why changes were needed. Issues that could have been easily explained, such as the much simpler rules for the linking elements, were not adequately explained in the guidelines of 1995, nor in those of 2005. Too many exceptions were introduced in 1995, and too many difficult new rules were introduced in 2005.

At the root of this less than desirable result lies the lack of direction that characterizes both reforms. Therefore, it is unpredictable what will happen when another decade has passed and the next planned reform comes along. In order to prevent the creation of further problems, we would recommend the following:

- I. Formulate guidelines for reforms in general, conducive to attaining ever greater orthographic stability.
- II. Take care of the foundation of these guidelines. Formulate an update of TE WINKEL 1865. Provide theoretical motivation. If at all possible, provide arguments for the choices made from research on writing, reading and learning to read and write. The merits of one way of writing as compared to

another can be assessed by means of simple psycholinguistic experiments. Let's use those tools to our advantage.

- III. Concepts used in spelling rules should be based on proper linguistic definitions.
- IV. Distinguish core and periphery. The core of the spelling system should be regulated by a dictionary and fixed rules. More marginal matters call for general guidelines and flexibility. Let us not forget that learning to write Dutch includes learning to use the language creatively.⁽³⁵⁾

Sadly, we cannot but arrive at the same conclusion as before, in 1997: Dutch spelling has gained nothing in stability from the latest reform.

Acknowledgements

We like to express our gratitude to those who read the concept version of this paper, and provided comments: Frans Daems, Johan De Schryver, John Gledhill, Rik Schutz, Rik Smits, Bob van Tiel, and Gerard Verhoeven. As usual, remaining errors are our own.

Bibliography

- BENNIS, H., A. NEIJT & A. VAN SANTEN (eds.) 1991. *De groene spelling*, Amsterdam: Bert Bakker.
- BOOIJ, G.E., C. HAMANS, G. VERHOEVEN, F. BALK & CH.H. VAN MINNEN 1979. *Spelling*. Spektator Cahiers 2, Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff.
- BOSMAN, A.M.T. & J.G. VAN HELL 2002. Orthography, phonology, and semantics. Concerted action in word perception, in: L. Verhoeven, C. Elbro & P. Reitsma (eds.) *Precursors of Functional Literacy*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 165-187.
- [Cobuild 1995] *Cobuild English Dictionary*. London: HarperCollins Publishers.
- DAEMS, F. 2006. *Spelling 2005 – de essentie*. <http://www.ua.ac.be/frans.daems>
- DE SCHRYVER, J. 2005. *Spelling 2005, de veranderingen*. Kuntich: Goudriaan Talenservice.
- DE SCHRYVER, J. & A. NEIJT 2005. *Handboek Spelling*, fifth edition. Mechelen: Wolters Plantyn.
- DE VRIES, M. & L.A. TE WINKEL 1866. *Woordenlijst voor de Spelling der Nederlandse Taal met aanwijzing van de geslachten der naamwoorden en de vervoeging der werkwoorden* 's-Gravenhage, Leiden, Arnhem: Thieme.
- DE VRIES, M. & L.A. TE WINKEL 1914. *Woordenlijst voor de spelling der Nederlandsche taal met aanwijzing van de geslachten der naamwoorden en de ver-*

(35) For laymen, amateurs, the spelling should be a handy toolbox, not a millstone, a *loodgieterstas* 'plumber's toolkit' (VAN DE LAAR 2006).

- voeging der werkwoorden. 7th edition by A. Beets. 's-Gravenhage and Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff, A.W. Sijthoff.
- [ERRATALIJST 2006]. *Erratalijst bij de Woordenlijst Nederlandse Taal*, <http://woordenlijst.org/erratalijst/>
- FRISSEN, S. & D. SANDRA 2002. Determinanten van werkwoordfouten in de Nederlandse spelling. Een experimenteel onderzoek bij jonge en ervaren spellers. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 7, 127-141.
- [GB 1995]. *Woordenlijst Nederlandse taal. Samengesteld door het Instituut voor Nederlandse Lexicologie in opdracht van de Nederlandse Taalunie*, Den Haag, Antwerpen: SDU Uitgevers/Standaard Uitgeverij.
- [GB 2005]. *Het Groene Boekje. Woordenlijst Nederlandse taal. Samengesteld door het Instituut voor Nederlandse Lexicologie in opdracht van de Nederlandse Taalunie*, Den Haag, Antwerpen: SDU Uitgevers/Standaard Uitgeverij.
- GEERTS, G., J. VAN DEN BROECK & A. VERDOODT 1977. Successes and Failures in Dutch Spelling Reform, in: Fishman, J.A. (ed.) *Advances in the Creation and Revision of Writing Systems*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 179-245.
- GENOOTSCHAP ONZE TAAL & DANIËLS, W. (ed.) 2006. *Het witte boekje. Spellinggids van het Nederlands*, Utrecht: Het Spectrum.
- GENOOTSCHAP ONZE TAAL & W. DANIËLS 2006. *Het groen-witte verschillenboekje*. 's-Hertogenbosch: Adr. Heinen Uitgevers.
- HAGERS, P. 1991. Spelling en uitgeverij, in: BENNIS ET AL. (1991), 72-81.
- HEEMSKERK, J. & W. ZONNEVELD 2000. *Uitspraakwoordenboek*. Utrecht: Het Spectrum.
- HEYNE, G. & M. HOFMANS 1988. *Speling in de spelling. Rapportage van het publieksonderzoek en het professionelenonderzoek 'Spellingvoorkeuren van Nederlanders en Vlamingen'*. IVA and Burke International. Tilburg and Brussel.
- [Interview with C.M. de Gloppe 2005] Groningse hoogleraar: nieuwe spelling moet leerbaar zijn. *Groninger Internet Courant* 6-10-2005, <http://www.gic.nl/VerlengdBericht.asp?katern=1&ali=25826>
- ISABELLE, P. & L. BOURBEAU 1985. TAUM-aviation. Its technical features and some experimental results. *Computational Linguistics* 11, 18-27.
- KLEIN, M. 2005. De groenste spelling van afleidingen met -loos. *Vaktaal. Tijdschrift van de Landelijke Vereniging voor Neerlandici* 19 (2/3), 17-18.
- KROTT, A. 2001. *Analogy in morphology: the selection of linking elements in Dutch compounds*, Nijmegen: PhD Dissertation, MPI Series in Psycholinguistics.
- KROTT, A., SCHREUDER, R., & BAAYEN, H.R. 2001. Analogy in morphology: modeling the choice of linking morphemes in Dutch, *Linguistics* 39, 51-93.
- NEIJT, A. 2002a. Spelling Legislation in Flanders and the Netherlands, in: Bommes, M., Noack, C., and Tophinke, D. (eds.) *Sprache als Form*. Westdeutscher Verlag, Wiesbaden, 212-221.
- NEIJT, A. 2002b. Wetgeving voor spelling, *Nederlandse taalkunde* 7, 286-291.
- NEIJT, A. 2005. Spelling Reform, in: Brown, K. (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, Oxford: Elsevier, 68-71.

- NEIJT, A. & A.M. NUNN 1997. The recent history of Dutch Orthography. Problems solved and created, *Leuven contributions in linguistics and philology* 86, 1–26.
- NEIJT, A. & R. REINSMA 1995. *De nieuwe Spellinggids van de Nederlandse Taal*. Utrecht: Het Spectrum/Van Dale lexicografie.
- NEIJT A. & R. SCHREUDER 2007. Rhythm versus analogy – prosodic form variation in Dutch compounds. *Language and Speech* (in press).
- NEIJT A. & R. SCHREUDER (to appear). Asymmetrical phoneme-grapheme mapping of coronal plosives in Dutch. *Written Language and Literacy*.
- NEIJT, A., SCHREUDER, R. & BAAYEN, H. 2004. Seven years later. The effect of spelling on interpretation. *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 21, 134–145.
- NUNN, A.M. 1998. *Dutch orthography. A systematic investigation of the spelling of Dutch words*. Nijmegen: PhD Dissertation, LOT dissertation series.
- NUNN A.M. & A. NEIJT 1997. Rules and exceptions in the spelling of loan words in Dutch. *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 14, 147–157.
- [Overzicht 2005]. *Overzicht trefwoorden met spellingwijziging*
http://taalunieversum.org/spelling/persberichten/overzicht_trefwoorden_met_spellingwijziging
- PERMENTIER, L. 2005. ‘Meer dan een rimpeling op een kalme zee. De veranderingen in het nieuwe Groene Boekje’. *Onze Taal* 7/8, 195
- [Persverklaring 2005]
http://taalunieversum.org/taalunie/persverklaring_vlaams_minister_vandenbroucke
- [PUBLIKATIE 1974]. *De spelling van de Nederlandse taal*. 's-Gravenhage: Staatsuitgeverij,
- REITSMA, P. 1983. *Phonemic and graphemic codes in learning to read*. PhD dissertation, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam.
- RENKEMA, J. (ed.) 1998. *Spellingwijzer Onze Taal*, Amsterdam: Contact.
- ROGERS, H. 2005. *Writing Systems: A Linguistic Approach*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- ROOIJACKERS, P., M. DE WIT, N. DOKTER, H. VAN DEN BOSSCHE, G. DUCHÂTEAU & R. RYMENANS 2006. ‘Twee soorten spelling, wat doet u ons aan?’ *Trouw* 15-8-2006.
- RYMENANS R. 2006. Spelling 2005: implicaties voor het onderwijs?, *Vonk* 35, 32–35.
- SCHAAP, G.C. 1974. Geschiedkundig overzicht van de samenwerking tussen Nederland en België op het gebied van de spelling, in: *De spelling van de Nederlandse taal*, publikatie van het Ministerie van Onderwijs en Wetenschappen. Staatsuitgeverij: 's-Gravenhage.
- SCHREUDER, R., A. NEIJT, F. VAN DER WEIDE & R.H. BAAYEN 1998. Regular Plurals in Dutch Compounds: Linking Graphemes or Morphemes?, *Language and Cognitive Processes* 13:5, p. 551–573.
- SIEGENBEEK, M. 1804. *Verhandeling over de Nederduitsche spelling ter bevordering van de eenparigheid in dezelve*. Dordrecht: Werken der Bataafsche Maatschappij van Taal- en Dichtkunde.
- [Spellingfolder 2006]. *Verandert de Spelling alweer?*

- <http://taalunieversum.org/spelling/Spellingfolder-NL.pdf>
- [*Spellingrapport* 1994]. Neijt, A. & J. Zuidema (eds.) *Spellingdossier*. Vol. 1, *Spellingrapport. Voorzeten* 44, 's-Gravenhage: Stichting Bibliographia Neerlandica.
- [*Taaltelefoon* 2006]. *Spelling de regels op een rij*. www.vlaanderen.be/taaltelefoon
- TE WINKEL, L.A. 1863. *Ontwerp der Spelling*, Leiden: D. Noothoven van Goor.
- TE WINKEL, L.A. 1865. *De Grondbeginselen der Nederlandsche Spelling. Regeling der spelling voor het Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal*. Leiden: D. Noothoven van Goor. Revised edition of 1863, with a preface of M. de Vries.
- [*Uitleg Extra* 1996]. Het ABC van de nieuwe spelling. *Uitleg Extra* 12, nr.12. (Journal edited by the information service of the Dutch ministry of education, cultural affairs and science).
- [*Van Dale* 1995]. GEERTS, G. & H. HEESTERMANS (eds.), *Van Dale groot woordenboek der Nederlandse taal. Twaalfde druk in de nieuwe spelling*. Utrecht-Antwerpen: Van Dale lexicografie.
- [*Van Dale* 2005]. DEN BOON, T. & D. GEERAERTS (eds.), *Van Dale groot woordenboek van de Nederlandse taal. Veertiende, herziene uitgave*, Utrecht-Antwerpen: Van Dale lexicografie.
- VAN DE LAAR, F. 2006. De spelling: loodgieterstas of lichtgewicht gereedschapskist? *Tekstblad* 12, 53-56.
- VAN HEUVEN, V.J. 2002. Effects of Diaeresis on Visual Word Recognition in Dutch, in: M. Neef, A. Neijt & R. Sproat (eds.), *The Relation Of Writing to Spoken Language*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- VAN HEUVEN, V.J.J.P. VAN, A.H. NEIJT & M. HIJZELENDORP 1995. Automatische indeling van Nederlandse woorden op basis van etymologische filters. *Spektator* 23, 279-291.
- VAN MAANEN, H. 2005. <http://www.vanmaanen.org/hans/bladgroen.html>
- VAN MAANEN, H. 2006. *Hoe heeft het Groene Boekje dat bedoeld? Enkele vragen aan de Nederlandse Taalunie over de nieuwe spelling*. Antwoorden: Henk Verkuyl, Frans Daems, Dirk Geeraerts en Dominiek Sandra. <http://www.onzetaal.nl/2006/1/spelling.php#8>
- VAN STERKENBURG, P. 1991. Het Groene Boekje, in: BENNIS ET AL. (1991) 54–71.
- VERHOEVEN, G. 1985. *De strategieën van de spelling. Een analyse van het spellingvraagstuk*. Proefschrift Utrecht. Wolters-Noordhoff: Groningen.
- VERHOEVEN, G. 2007. Argumentatie in de discussie over de spelling-2005. *Tijdschrift voor Taalbeheersing* 29, 20-44.
- VERKUYL, H. 2005. *Moet het Nederlands af en toe naar de kapper?* <http://www.let.uu.nl/~henk.verkuyl/personal/siegenbeekhtml.htm>
- [*Werkgroep* 2006]. *Werkgroep spelling reageert. Als door één pen geschreven. Is de Witte Spelling beter?* http://taalunieversum.org/spelling/witte_spelling/werkgroep_spelling_reageert
- [*Woordenlijst* 1954]. *Woordenlijst van de Nederlandse Taal samengesteld in opdracht van de Nederlandse en de Belgische regering*. Den Haag: SDU Uitgeverij.